THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., Master of the Temple, c/o S.P.C.K. House, Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2, to whom MSS. should be sent.

Vol. XXVIII APRIL, 1934 No. 166

EDITORIAL

Easter! There was a time when Russians habitually greeted one another at this season with the words "Christ is Risen!", to which the response was "He is Risen indeed! Alleluya!" We in England never rose to these heights of spiritual camaraderie. There are some who wish that we could, and did. The nearest approach to it is made by the Irishman who puts his head into a compartment of the Liverpool mail at Euston, and says to a silent and suspicious set of total strangers, "God bless all here!" But it may be that if you do not climb very high, you are less likely to fall, or, if you do, you will not be permanently crippled. You can pick yourself up and carry on. And there is something about Easter in England which goes very deep. Those annual communicants, those troops of people who appear then and at no other time! It is strange that, wanting the spiritual contact so much that they break the custom of twelve months, they should not want it more often. But there it is. And, as Professor Burkitt said a year or so ago in the *Modern Churchman*, "I do not think that the clergy always realize that a kind of belief in the value of Holy Communion, and in the religion which Holy Communion represents, is sometimes dumbly testified by staying away, more than by perfunctory attendance." This is what is meant by the verdict, the truth of which is easily denied, which is in some respects grotesquely untrue, that England is still a Christian country. This lay behind the interest of vast numbers of people in Prayer Book Revision, this is the *raison d'être* of the feeling which many people have that the House of Commons has a real right, apart from any legal claim, to be consulted about such things. It is hard to measure precisely how much this right amounts to. Our own reply would be a vague "Something, but not very much." Whatever it be, it is evident at Eastertide that there is in the English people a great deal of

Christian or sub-Christian faith. Let it be the task of the Easter message delivered in Cathedrals and Parish Churches to purge this, to illuminate it, and to unite it to the Lord who gave it. The Easter Collect, which some think prosaic, tells us the true vocation of just such "good desires."

But this is not all. God forbid! The reply of the whole Church to an Act of God is always slow. It is formulated over a large area and in course of time. Some of the reeds are rather broken and some of the flax is only smouldering. That many of us should be unadventurous is perhaps to be expected. We are like that. The majority of people are like that. When Karl Barth first thought out his theology of crisis, it was in order that he might have a real message for his mountain-flock. That some of them were thrilled and converted through the explosive tumult of his words we do not doubt. Some, we suspect, were puzzled and alarmed. Nevertheless, the reply of the whole Church, when it is made to the Act of God at Easter, will not be true unless there are some, even many, who generously leap out in answer to the challenge. And who are those generous souls? They are the devout communicants.

Those splendid words, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast; not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness: but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth," are surely enough to quicken a full response. If at other seasons, when the people are unpatient and the earth is unquiet, our Lord seems not to be King, at least He is at Easter. We are tempted sometimes to wonder whether we can have what is sometimes called hundred per cent. Christianity in parochial, organized religion. Can eagerness be kindled regularly, as the sun rises every morning, and the spring is reborn every year? Do forms make formalists, or do they, as Pusey said, form those who are willing to be formed? Can we have the stability which is a guarantee of permanence, with the dangerous living which is the hope of victory? Can we have all this? What a thing to ask at Easter! When the great dragon, that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, is cast down! When the one perfectly generous thing ever done in the history of the world has just been crowned by a victory so unworldly, so uncommercial, so unmilitary, that even the Risen Christ has no throne, no sceptre, no armed forces and no property! When we are invited to affirm our faith in the supremacy of the spirit by joining in a Sacrament

which is called by some materialistic, but in reality involves the very maximum of spiritual adventure! When we summon up our dim desires, and our lame, timid, precarious, short-sighted faith, and thrust out our stained hands, and receive that which preserves body and soul unto everlasting life! "He which testifieth saith, Surely, I come quickly! Even so, come, Lord Jesus!"

An article which we publish this month illustrates the importance of the study of fiction. There is one experienced parish priest of our acquaintance who is accustomed to say that he gets many of his sermons out of novels. It is not that he ever mentions the names of them in his sermons, still less that he advertises that he will preach next Sunday evening on the "best-seller" of the moment. But his novel-reading makes him aware of what people are thinking about. It is probable that he has enough wisdom to be guided not by what the novelists write, which is often sad nonsense, but by what he imagines to be the reaction of the readers. His reasoning is perhaps somewhat after this sort: "This is the kind of diet on which people are being fed. These are the ideas which are being put into circulation. I must not let the writers get away with it. I do not believe for a moment that the people of my parish or the people whom I see in trains or omnibuses are secretly meditating the kind of things which people do in books. They are not contemplating adultery, murder or embezzlement. They are plain people going back after work to a reasonably happy home. But readers of novels are gradually acquiring the impression that a man and his wife may be expected after about fifteen years to have become tired of one another and to want a change. I must do my best to sublimate their instincts." The wise preacher reasons thus. And, as of old, "because the preacher was wise, he still taught the people knowledge," and his sermons were audible.

Here are two recent novels, of which the former is the more workmanlike, and the other contains more sermon-material, both direct and indirect. One is Miss Dorothy Sayers's *Nine Tailors*, an admirable account of crime-detection in an East Anglian village, with a lot of scholarly information about change-ringing, in which it appears that Lord Peter is an adept. The other is Mr. Bruce Marshall's *Prayer for the Living*, a queer mixture of coarseness, religion and idyllic young love, with bits of genuine pathos. There is a saintly Scottish Bishop, and two priests, one well-meaning but ineffective, the other kind-hearted but unspiritual. Add to these Mr. Malcolm Muggeridge's

Winter in Moscow, not a novel, but novel-like, a moving account of some of the tragedies which conducted visitors to Russia do not see.

There seems to be a fashion now for books about all the people who go to work in the same bus or the same train. Miss Norah James's *The Straphangers* is a good example. Why does not someone write a Church novel about all the members of a P.C.C. ?

The Annual Festival of the Church Tutorial Classes Association, of which the Bishop of Southwark is Chairman, is being held at Southwark Cathedral on Saturday, May 5. There will be Corporate Communion at 9.30, Council Meeting at 11.30, Public Meeting at 2.30, when Canon Hodgson will speak on "A Faith for To-day," and Evensong at 5, with sermon by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The invitation card says, "R.S.V.P. to the Secretary, 16, Russell Square, W.C. 1, stating if breakfast, lunch, or tea will be required." The C.T.C.A. is so good a thing, its syllabuses, bibliographies and other publications are so scholarly and yet so pastoral, and its classes are so much beloved by those who use them, that we hope that many of our readers will find it possible to be present at the Festival.

Canon Herbert Knight, Vicar of Shortlands, Rural Dean of Bromley, was one of our regular contributors, and his eager personality will be greatly missed by his friends. He was one of those scholarly priests who are always seeking to bring fresh light to bear on the Faith. He had a great regard for the 1928 Liturgy, and his latest publication in book-form was a discerning account of its structure and meaning. His last article in THEOLOGY illustrated his fondness for antithetical titles—"Adventus," or "Parousia"? Scrupulous in all pastoral duties, he felt that the most important of all was the ministry of teaching. Men of his type are greatly needed.

A LITTLE SERMON FOR EASTER

"Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness" (Rev. i. 5).

It sounds an unsatisfying text for an Easter sermon. Anyone, it may be thought, can be a witness. All that is wanted is knowledge of the fact, and willingness to speak the truth. Ah, yes; that is for witness to a single fact, or set of facts. But supposing that what is required is evidence for a universal principle, or for the worth of human nature, or for what happens after death—that is another matter.

There are *things* which have something of this quality. The spring is a perpetual witness that the earth has life. The crocus, the primrose, the tulip, the hawthorn and the may, the oak and the ash, are reassuring.

The winter's sleep was long and deep,
But the earth is awakened and gay.

Each morning is a kind of spring. Cock-crow and sunrise are witnesses to the fact that "He that keepeth Israel will not sleep. Behold, He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep."

The beauty of the earth is a witness. "Nature," said James Mozley in a famous sermon, "is all the time working like a machine, and sleeping like a picture." The clouds and "the clear shining after rain," the mountains and the rivers and the valleys and the plains, the grace and strength of their natural inhabitants, the horse with his glory, and the dove that is covered with silver wings and her feathers like gold—these testify to the Mind behind phenomena.

In another way children are a witness. They renew a sometimes fading faith in human nature. We are depressed, we are disappointed, we find ourselves disappointing, we are tempted to be cynical or despairing. And the sight of children, the sound of their merry peals of laughter, the sublime audacity with which they draw from slight experience a conclusion of universal optimism and world-wide charity—these things refresh a tired spirit and renew a failing confidence. *We* may come to the end of our trust in our own nature, but our nature is perpetually reaching out to grow into posterity, and always with a new hope. Macbeth saw in a vision of terror the line of his rival stretching out to six and seven generations. "What, will the line stretch out to the crack of doom?" We see a line which is, either actually or collectively, our own, which points to the glory which shall be revealed in us.

It is on this universal scale that the Risen Christ is a witness. Good Friday was, historically, a day of broken hopes. They

trusted that it had been He which should redeem Israel. A few bolder spirits had perhaps cherished even larger hopes. Here, they may have thought, was One who bade fair to fulfil the promise made to Abraham, "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Almost they had begun to think already that He would recreate humanity. But "all He was is overborne," and they, with weary feet, must now begin again to tread the barren path of disillusioned loneliness.

And then—a little candle throws its beams across the darkness. At first a tiny, flickering illumination. The sight of a stone rolled away, a voice which made a woman's heart stand still for joy, tidings which made two men run both of them together till the younger man outran the elder and came first to the sepulchre, some grave-clothes lying on the ground, but lying in such form that somehow even they suggest "the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness," and then, before the greatness of what is stirring in their imagination has had time to crystallize into a sure belief, a manifest Presence and "Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself." And then, little by little, spreading through the world, the conviction, the converting and life-changing conviction, that the Faithful Witness is the first-fruits of the victory of God and Love and Christian Faith.

In the first rush of emotion it was a personal thing: "Our Friend, our Captain, has been given back to us. The night was real, but this is morning." Then by degrees the meaning is more and more perceived.

We, too, have something of that immediate personal reaction, that surprise. The liturgical year is so arranged that the Church shall pass on the third day from solemn Litany and sad Gospel of the Passion to a shout of triumph. But it can never be for us that, and no more.

It is a witness to an eternal truth: that the way of life which Jesus of Nazareth followed, and commended, and commanded, is the divine way. The belief is not an easy one. It all seemed so small; it was lived on a tiny corner of the earth; few people knew of it, and of those some hated it and very few understood it; it had ended in inglorious failure. Yet in that obscure life had been embodied the purpose of Almighty God. As a mother seems to "see all heaven in a cradle," so, much more, Christendom sees in our Lord the vocation and the redemption of all mankind. To serve, as He served, without any kind of self-regard, to meet all the evil of the world by loving the evil-doers, to oppose the forces of Satan by continual obedience to the will of God, to pour into the mixed crucible of human motive the one ingredient which was needed and could come from no

other quarter—namely, a love which was divine in origin and quality, and yet relied on nothing except its own power of loving to the end—all this was the true way of God. To know this, as verified by Easter, by the Faithful Witness, is our Christian knowledge, and to possess its inexhaustible treasure, its perpetual recreating power, is our inheritance as Christian men.

THE ORIGINS OF THE EPICLESIS

PART II

III.—THE EARLY THEOLOGY OF CONSECRATION

(*a*) In the West

It is convenient to start with the one early Western text which offers any point of contact with St. Cyril's teaching that the Holy Ghost consecrates the Eucharist. St. Cyprian (*Ep.* 64. 4) warns the faithful of Assuræ to reject the ministrations of their quondam bishop Fortunatian (who was seeking to recover his see after apostatizing), partly on the ground that "the Eucharist cannot there be consecrated where the Spirit is not." In its context this is scarcely a valid parallel to the Syrian theology. Cyprian is arguing from his private theory that an apostate cleric automatically and irrecoverably forfeits the whole grace of ordination. It is the absence of the Spirit as consecrating *Fortunatian*, not as consecrating the Eucharist, which is in his mind.

Cyprian's theology of eucharistic consecration is stated incidentally, but with the emphasis of repetition, in his sixty-third *Epistle*, from which we may take this: "For if Jesus Christ our Lord and God is himself the High Priest (*summus sacerdos*) and was the first to offer himself in sacrifice (*sacrificium se ipsum primus obtulit*) to the Father and bade this to be done for the *anamnesis** of himself (*in sui commemorationem*), clearly that priest truly exercises the place of Christ (*ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur*) who imitates that which Christ did, and he then offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father if he undertake to offer according to that way in which he sees that Christ himself offered" (*Ep.* 63. 14). Eleven times in this Epistle Cyprian repeats that the Last Supper (which he seems to treat as a sacrifice in its own right, apart

* *Cf. inf.*

from Calvary) is the essential model for the Eucharist, in which the "priest" in the person of (*vice*) the "High Priest" must repeat the words and actions laid down once for all in the pattern Eucharist. Twice he cites St. Paul's account of the Institution and at once repeats his thesis—this is what the celebrant must imitate.

The African Church was a daughter of Rome, where St. Justin had sketched the theology of the Eucharist a century before Cyprian. I must apologize for reproducing yet again a famous passage, but Justin's account illuminates the whole early theology of the Eucharist, and especially that of Hippolytus. No one was ever in a better position to tell us what the second-century Church as a whole considered "apostolic." A Palestinian, born *c.* A.D. 100, he knows something of the peculiar tenets of Judæo-Christianity. Converted at Ephesus *c.* A.D. 135, he holds by the millenarianism that marks the Asiatic school of Polycarp and Papias. And his *Apology* speaks for the Roman Church in the years when the claim to *the* "Apostolic Tradition" was being thrashed out with the great gnostic heresiarchs.

Apol., i. 66: "For we take not this as common bread or common drink; but in the same way that *by the Word of God* Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh and took flesh and blood for our salvation (ὃν τρόπον διὰ Λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰ.Χ. . . . καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα . . . ἔσχεν), so we have been taught (οὕτως ἐδιδάχθημεν) that the food which has been made Eucharist (εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν) by a formula of prayer which comes from him (*i.e.*, from Jesus, δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ*) . . . is (εἶναι) the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For (γάρ) the Apostles in the memoirs which come from them, called Gospels, handed on the tradition that it was thus commanded them (οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς): that Jesus took bread and making Eucharist† said, 'Do this for the *anamnesis* of me (εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου), This is my Body': and likewise took the cup and making Eucharist said, 'This is my Blood.'"

Justin insists that his eucharistic theology depends on his

* δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ'αὐτοῦ can mean: (1) "By the prayer of the Logos who is from Him" (*i.e.*, from the Father; so, *e.g.*, Gavin, *Lit. and Worship*, p. 94). Or (2) "By a prayer *to* the Logos who is from" the Father (so, apparently, Lietzmann, p. 77; for taking Λόγου thus one might *cp.* Luke vi. 12, ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ; Gal. iii. 3, πίστις Ἰησοῦ, etc.). Both (1) and (2) leave αὐτοῦ with no proper antecedent, and it seems preferable (3) to take it with "Jesus," as above. *Cf. Apol.*, i. 13, "we worship ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας . . . ὅση δύναμις," which is unequivocal and strikingly similar.

† εὐχαριστεῖν in Justin, Hippolytus, etc., has a technical sense which the English "Give thanks" conveys no better than "Thanksgiving Day" conveys "the feast of the Blessed Sacrament." *Cf. eucharistiam facere* used by Cæcilius of Biltha at Cyprian's Council *de Rebaptismate*, i. For *anamnesis*, *v. inf.*

theology of the Incarnation, *Ave verum corpus natum de Maria virgine.* What does he mean by "*as by the Word of God* Jesus was made flesh"? He is referring back to his own account (*Ap.*, i. 13) of the Annunciation. There he cites loosely St. Gabriel's message (Luke i. 35), "Thou shalt conceive (ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου) of *a** Holy Spirit, and the Power (δύναμις) of God shall overshadow thee." Justin then explains: "'The Spirit' (πνεῦμα), then, and the 'Power' from God it is correct (*or* 'customary,' θέμις) to understand as none other than *the Logos.*" In other words, Justin thinks of the Incarnate not as "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary," but as "conceived *by the Logos.*" He takes it for granted that *the words* πνεῦμα ἅγιον, "*Holy Spirit*," *mean the Logos*, and he applies *this* theology to the Eucharist.

It is essential at this point to ascertain that in Justin we have not to do with an isolated freak of language. The following *catena*, by no means exhaustive, will shew how normal his usage is.

(1) St. Irenæus, *Hær.*, V. i. 3: "The Word of the Father and Spirit of God united (*sing.*) to the ancient substance of Adam's formation, perfected (*sing.*) a living and perfect man," *Verbum Patris et Spiritus Dei adunitus . . . perfecit. . . .* (2) Pope St. Callistus I. (*c.* A.D. 220), *ap. Philosophumena*, ix. 12: "The Spirit which was made flesh in the Virgin," τὸ ἐν τῇ παρθένῳ σαρκωθὲν πνεῦμα. (3) St. Hippolytus, *Contra Noetum*, 4 (of the Eternal Christ): "For he was Logos, he was Spirit, he was Power." Λόγος γὰρ ἦν, Πνεῦμα ἦν, Δύναμις ἦν. (*cf.* Justin on Luke i. 35, *sup.*). *Ibid.* 16: "For what was begotten of the Father but the Spirit, that is to say the Logos?" . . . ἀλλ' ἢ Πνεῦμα, τουτέστιν ὁ Λόγος. (4) Tertullian, *Adv. Praxeam.* 26 (on Luke. i. 35): "This 'Spirit of God' will be the same (as the) Word," *Hic Spiritus Dei idem erit Sermo*; and again: "The Spirit is the Word and the Word the Spirit," *Spiritus Sermo est et Sermo Spiritus.* This from a Montanist! (5) St. Cyprian, *Q. idola non.* 11: "The Word is the 'Power of God,' who comes upon the Virgin, and the Holy Spirit is clothed with flesh," *Sermo est Virtus Dei . . . hic in virginem illabitur, carnem Spiritus Sanctus induitur.* (6) Lactantius, iv. 12: "That Holy Spirit of God coming down . . . chose an holy virgin in whose womb he might secretly place himself," *Sanctus ille Spiritus Dei . . . sanctam virginem cujus utero se insinuaret elegit.* (7) St. Athanasius, *De Incarnat.* 18: The Logos "coming down to us formed for himself the body from the Virgin," ἐκ παρθένου πλάττει ἑαυτῷ τὸ σῶμα. (8) St. Hilary, *De Trinit.*,

* The importance of the omission of the article here is noted by Athanasius, *ad Serap.*, i. 4.

ii. 26: "The Holy Spirit . . . mingled himself with the nature of human flesh, "*Spiritus Sanctus . . . naturæ se humanæ carnis immiscuit; cf.* Hilary, *in Matt.* ii. 5: Jesus "made flesh by the Word," *Per Verbum caro factus.* (9) St. Ambrose, *De Myst.* 58: "The Body of Christ is the Body of the Divine Spirit, for the Spirit is Christ," *Spiritus est Christus* (St. A., from the context, is rather explaining this old terminology than using it himself). (10) Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Synopsis of Christian Doctrine*:* "Christ fashioned to himself a body in the womb." A variant of the same idea is found in the *Ep. of the Apostles* 14 (*c.* A.D. 160); Sibylline Bks., 8. 469 *sqq.*; and perhaps Origen *in Luc.* 14. Writers before Justin who call the Son πνεῦμα are ii. *Clement* 9 and Hermas (S. v. 2, 5, and 6). There is even that dark saying of St. Paul, "The Lord is the Spirit."

With these passages before us it is easy to see what the liturgy of the *Testament of our Lord* means when it distributes communion with the formula, "The Body of Jesus Christ the Holy Spirit." St. Justin would have found it a natural expression. But Justin's explanation raises at once the further question, What is this λόγος εὐχῆς, this "formula of prayer," which comes from Jesus himself, "by" (διὰ) which "food is made Eucharist"? I can only suggest that Justin himself has told us both what it is and how it is known to be "from" Jesus. "*For* the Apostles handed on the tradition, that so Jesus made the pattern Eucharist: 'Do this for the *anamnesis*'; over the bread, 'This is my Body'; over the cup, 'This is my Blood.'" This is the "Apostolic Tradition" of the liturgy at Rome before ever Hippolytus was born.

Before comparing Hippolytus with Justin it is convenient to set out certain passages from writers more or less contemporary which from various aspects may illuminate them both.

(11) St. Irenæus, iv. 16. 5: "He took bread . . . and made Eucharist saying, 'This is my Body' . . . and taught the new oblation of the new covenant." (12) *Ibid.*, iv. 18. 4: The Jews cannot offer "the pure sacrifice" of the Eucharist "because they did not receive the Logos by whom it is offered," . . . *Verbum per quod offertur.*† (13) *Ibid.*, v. 2, 3: "The cup and the bread receives the Logos of God and becomes the Eucharist of the Body and Blood of Christ," . . . ὁ ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν Λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ γίνεται. . . . (14) Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.*, i. 14: Jesus "has not despised bread, whereby he makes his own very Body to be present," . . . *quo ipsum*

* This is possibly not Theodore's, but it is not later than the fifth century. It is known only in a Syriac version. Ed. Mingana, *B.J.R.L.*, 5, p. 304.

† Three MSS. omit *per* to adapt the passage to mediæval theology.

corpus suum repraesentat. (15) *Ibid.*, iv. 40: "Jesus took bread . . . and made it his own Body by saying 'This is my Body,'" . . . *corpus* (*panem*) *suum fecit, Hoc est corpus meum dicendo.* (16) St. Cyprian, *Ep.* 63. 17: "The Passion is the Lord's sacrifice, which we offer," *Passio est Domini sacrificium, quod offerimus.*

All these writers clearly attribute the Eucharist to the operation of the Second Person. We may add to them a passage, of special importance for the understanding of Hippolytus' Canon, from his *Contra Noetum*, 4: (17) "He [*sc.* the Logos] is then that Flesh which was offered as a sacrificial gift (προσενεχθεῖσα δῶρον) by the Logos of the Father, which was (taken) of 'the Spirit' [in the context='Logos'; *cf.* (3) *sup.*] and the Virgin, being shewn to be the perfect Son of God. It is clear, therefore, that he himself offered himself to the Father." It is upon this background that Hippolytus' Canon must be studied.* It runs as follows:

§ 1. "We make Eucharist to thee, O God, through thy Beloved Servant Jesus Christ, whom in the latter times thou sentest unto us (to be) our Saviour and Redeemer and the Angel of thy counsel, who is thy Word inseparable (from thee), by whom thou madest all things and in whom thou wast well pleased. § 2. (Whom) thou sentest from heaven into the womb of the Virgin, and who, having dwelt in the womb, was made flesh and shewn to be thy Son, born of 'Holy Spirit' (=Logos; *cf.* 17, *sup.*], and the Virgin. § 3. Who, fulfilling thy will, spread forth his arms in his suffering, gathering a holy people unto thee, that by his suffering he might deliver from suffering them that have put their trust in thee: Who, when he was being given up to his voluntary suffering that he might loose death and burst the bonds of the devil and tread down hell, and enlighten the righteous and fix the boundary [? of the Church], and shew forth his resurrection, § 4, took bread and making Eucharist to thee said, 'This is my Body which is broken for you.' Likewise also the cup, saying, 'This is my Blood which is shed for you. When ye do this ye make my *anamnesis*.' § 5. Making the *anamnesis*, therefore, of thy death and thy resurrection [addressed to the Son], we offer to thee [the Father] the bread and the cup, making Eucharist to thee because (ἐφ' οἷς) thou hast found us worthy (*or* 'bidden us,' κατηξίωσας) to stand before thee and minister to thee in priesthood. § 6. And we beseech thee that, uniting them with thee, thou wouldst grant unto all thy Saints who partake in order that they may be filled with the 'Holy Spirit' [=Logos] for the confirmation of their

* The only important variants are in §§ 5 and 6, which have already been discussed.

faith in the Truth (*cf.* Serapion, *inf.*], that we [*or* 'they'] may praise and glorify thee through thy Servant Jesus Christ, through whom glory and honour be unto thee, to the Father and to the Son with the Holy Ghost* in the Holy Church now and for ever. Amen."

The most obvious thing about this prayer is that down to the last clause it is not a prayer at all. Up to that point it makes no petition of any kind, but simply a series of statements. These are addressed to the Father, but are entirely concerned with the Logos (1) in his eternal relation to the Father, (2) acting in his own Incarnation, (3) offering himself (*cf.* 17, *sup.*) in his "voluntary" passion, (4) setting the model of his own *anamnesis*. It seems from (17) that the phrasing is in part Hippolytus' own, but it is clear from Justin that the *substance* of the prayer is by no means of his invention. I suggest that *Apol.*, i. 66, is nothing but a condensed abstract of a prayer on the same model, cast in the form of an explanation of its contents. Both writers refer this type of eucharistic prayer to "Apostolic Tradition," both imply that while the celebrant has some freedom of phrasing, he is bound to mention certain points, and the points are *the same in both writers* (if Justin's "for our salvation" refers to the Passion, as is probable).†

Hippolytus' prayer resumes. § 5. Making the *anamnesis* he commanded, we offer the bread and cup as he offered them, making Eucharist to thee as he made Eucharist to thee, ministering as priests to thee, because thou hast found us worthy (*or* "bidden us") so to minister. § 6 introduces the communion: Grant to thy holy people (gathered in his outspread arms, § 3), who partake of the Victim in order that they may be filled with the Victim, that their faith in him may be fulfilled—grant that they may praise thee through the High Priest by whom alone perfect worship is rendered—and so to the doxology.

The first part of this prayer is simply a *description* of a sacrifice in which the heavenly High Priest alone acts, and in which the Church takes part, as it were passively, by faith. As the Logos came down, unsought, to provide himself as the Victim of Calvary, so he has provided the means by which to descend (*καταβαίνει*, Athanasius, *etc.*, *inf.*‡) to provide the victim of the eucharistic sacrifice. The *sacerdos* exercises the place of the *summus sacerdos* by saying and doing exactly what

* *Πνεῦμα* here is certainly the Third Person. In just the same way, throughout the long analysis of his creed with which Hippolytus closes his *Philosophumena* (Tr. Legge, S.P.C.K., ii., pp. 172-8), he never once mentions the Holy Ghost (though he goes into all sorts of minor details, like the question of sex among Angels), and then suddenly ends with this explicit Trinitarian doxology. Liturgical *formulæ* imposed a nominal Trinitarianism on other ante-Nicene writers whose own working theology is patently Binitarian.

† *Cf.* also Justin, *Dial.* 41.

‡ *Cf.* John vi. 51, *ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν ὁ καταβάς.*

he ordained (Cyprian). "By saying" these words Christ "made the bread his Body" (Tertullian 15, *sup.*), and "by the bread" Christ still "makes his own very Body to be present" (14, *sup.*); "the bread receives the Logos and becomes the Eucharist" (Irenæus 13, *sup.*) in virtue of the promise made when "he taught the new oblation" (11, *sup.*), which is offered "by the Logos" (12, *sup.*). I submit that all this group of writers present, fragmentarily and summarily enough, one coherent and identical eucharistic theology, in which the whole emphasis is placed on the unseen action of the heavenly High Priest, the Logos, the Second Person of the Trinity. Its summary is the virtual promise, "When ye do this ye make my *anamnesis*."

The phrase "the *anamnesis* of the Passion" is used by early writers as the equivalent of "the Eucharist";* this is not easy to render in English, words like "remembrance," "memorial," etc., having a connotation of something "absent" which is by no means that of the Greek. It is, *e.g.*, the whole point of *Hebrews* ix. and x. that the sacrifices of the Old Testament were not an *apolutrosis* for sins, which would have taken them away, but an *anamnesis* of them which actually "*recalled*" them.† It is in this active sense that "the *anamnesis* of the Passion" *recalls* before God and man the Body broken and the Blood shed. "The Passion is the Lord's sacrifice, which we offer" (Cyprian 16, *sup.*).

Is this to say that these writers regard the Words of Institution as "consecratory"? It is always a delicate matter to distinguish the half-conscious differences in emphasis and meaning with which different ages may hold a substantially identical doctrine and terminology. These early writers do seem to have held that the Words of Institution duly recited over bread and mixed wine and water effected "the *anamnesis* of the Passion." And they certainly believed in a real Presence by the species. For Hippolytus the reserved Sacrament is simply *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*,‡ to be guarded with all care from profanation. If he could have heard Chrysostom's statement, "The priest in the Person of Christ recites, 'This is my Body': these words transform the elements," he might not have dissented, but it is a question if the matter would have presented itself to him quite in that way. The energetic and even crude language in which a writer like Justin affirms the real Presence ("the food . . . *is* the flesh") is apt to blind us to the fact

* *E.g.*, Justin, *Dial.*, 41. 1; Methodius, *Sympos.*, 3. 8, *inf.*, etc.

† *Cf.* Num. v. 15: The sacrifice for the wife suspected of adultery is *θυσία . . . ἀναμιμνήσκουσα ἁμαρτίαν*; 1 Kings xvii. 18: The widow of Sarepta says that Elijah's coming is *ἀναμνῆσαι ἀδικίας μου* and *therefore* her son has died; Philo, *Vit. Moys.*, ii. 107: The sacrifices of sinners *οὐ λύσιν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀλλ' ὑπόμνησιν ἐργάζονται*.

‡ Hauler, p. 117.

that the mode of thought is in some things not our own. There is nothing in Hippolytus' Canon, or, so far as I can see, in any of these early writers, which suggests a petition for "consecration" in the manner of an epiclesis, or which answers to the purport of the "prayer of humble access." The early terminology is exclusively *sacrificial*; words like κοινωνία are conspicuously absent.* This language of sacrifice is to us a metaphor, and one to which there attaches no clear picture, but an abstract idea. I suppose it a safe calculation that not more than one Anglican priest in a hundred has ever seen a bloody sacrifice and not more than one in a thousand has ever offered one. The two I have happened to witness were enlightening. There is a barbaric reality about the spouting blood and the life gasped out to God that one does not readily forget. And it is just this concrete reality which the word inevitably had for the early Church.† There cannot have been one among Hippolytus' communicants who had not witnessed, if only by chance, some of the innumerable sacrifices, public and private, which hallowed every event, public or domestic, in the city. To many of them sacrifice, the crude and bloody reality, had been the essential act of religion for half a lifetime before they heard of the Eucharist. When a third-century pagan converted in middle age like St. Cyprian says the Christian "priest offers a true and full sacrifice" he is apt to mean something a good deal more vivid than the modern priest who "offered Mass for so-and-so this morning."

Putting all the scanty evidence together, the whole conception which these early writers suggest is rather the "Real Sacrifice" than the "Real Presence." Or, better, there is a double Presence, that of the "Real Priest" as well as the "Real Victim," which together constitute the "Real Sacrifice." The whole emphasis and interest and devotion in Hippolytus is concentrated on the activity of the Divine Priest-Victim. So intense and vivid is the sense of this that at the consummation of the sacrifice it suffices to divert for an instant the address of the Canon from the Father to the Son. In the fourth century this is waning, though the survival of a direct address to the Son at this point in many liturgies which have felt the 'full force of later ideas‡ shews how deeply it had once impressed the mind

* Holy Communion and its graces are, of course, an integral part of their teaching. It is a question of emphasis and *the way* ideas are held. The fourth century, and especially Chrysostom, shews a definite change in this. But the real origins of that type of eucharistic piety which could head the liturgy "The Administration of Holy Communion" must be sought in the period of the early Clugniacs and the *Devotiones* studied by Dom Wilmart.

† *E.g.*, Justin, *Apol.*, 1. 13, where αἵματα, "bloods," stands absolutely for "sacrifices."

‡ Syriac St. James; Gk. St. James; Dêr Balyzeh; Ambrosian (*inf.*); and many in Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Collectio*, vol. ii.; St. Cyril and Egyptian St. Basil (Gk.).

of the Church. It is significant that those versions of Hippolytus' Canon which have interpolated an epiclesis have also changed "thy death" to "his death." They look, not to the Priest of Calvary, but to a "consecrator" of the elements, an idea for which the older theology left no room.

In the fourth-century documents phrase after phrase reveals that the idea has changed. It is no longer the heavenly High Priest, but, primarily, the earthly Church which offers the sacrifice. Attention necessarily shifts to the gifts she brings, but to which she cannot of herself impart the reality of the heavenly Victim. The emphasis is now on the Church's action, her petition for "consecration." We get prayers to "make the bread the Body" (St. Cyril), to "fill this bread with thy power" (St. Serapion), phrases like "to draw down the Logos" (St. Gregory Naz., *inf.*), or the "Holy Spirit" (Chrysostom). All this is novel, as novel as the talk of "transformation" which comes in everywhere in the same period. Like the feast of Corpus Christi and the cultus of the Host, for which all this directly prepares the way, it is a theological as well as a logical development of the simple sacrificial conception. Doubtless it is one which the Church has abundantly sanctioned. Certainly it is one to which the rite of 1662, with its entire concentration on communion *by* the elements (however the Presence be conceived), seems thoroughly committed. But this does not detract from the magnitude of the change which the fourth century made, and I suggest that it is just this change which made room for the very idea of a consecratory epiclesis.

The scantiness of our sources between A.D. 250 and 350 makes it impossible to trace the course of the change, and the survival of the old Logos=Spirit terminology in writers like Hilary makes it difficult to interpret some of the evidence we have. Thus when St. Optatus in Africa speaks of the "altar whereon the Holy Spirit descends at our prayer,"* it may be wiser not to be too certain of his meaning. Oddly enough, the first Western who undoubtedly mentions the epiclesis of the Holy Ghost is St. Ambrose, who is generally credited with the invention of the "Western" doctrine. In his *De Spiritu Sancto* (*c.* A.D. 381) he demands of those who deny the Spirit's full Deity, "How then should he not possess all the nature of God who is named by the priests with the Father and the Son in Baptism, who is invoked upon the oblations?"† Through the whole Macedonian controversy I can find no Eastern writer down to Isidore of Pelusium (*Ep.*, i. 109, *c.* A.D. 415) who thought of using the second part of that question as a weapon against the Pneumatomachi!

* *De Schism. Donat.*, vi. 1.; P.L. 11. 1064.
† *De S. S.*, iii. 16; P.L. 16. 837.

St. Ambrose's normal teaching is more conservative: "Today he gives us (this bread) which he himself as Priest daily consecrates with his own words."* In this connection I may cite the Milanese Mass for Maundy Thursday, which is of great antiquity. After the narrative of the Institution it continues: "This we do, this we celebrate, obedient, Lord, to *thy* commands . . . but it is thine, Almighty Father, now to send thine only-begotten Son whom thou didst freely send to them that sought him not . . . for the increase of faith and the remission of all sins."† With this we may compare one of the many Mozarabic epicleses, "Send forth, O Lord, thy Word from heaven, whereby our sins may be washed away and our oblations sanctified."‡ Or again there is a Gallican epiclesis which appears to retain traces of the old terminology: "We pray thee . . . may thy holy Word come down upon our offering, may the Spirit of thine immeasurable glory come down, may the gift of thy mercy of old time (*donum antiquæ indulgentiæ*) come down."§ None of these forms can be traced back to the fourth century, but they do suggest the period when the West was trying to adapt the new liturgical conventions to the old theology.

St. Augustine is acquainted with the doctrine that "the bread is not consecrated to be so great a sacrament, but by the invisible working of the Spirit of God," but his usual teaching is the old Logos theology. He speaks of "prayers that by the coming of the Word (*accedente Verbo*) it may become the Body and Blood of Christ"; of how "the Word comes to the element (*accedit Verbum ad elementum*) and it becomes the Sacrament, as it were, the Word made visible (*Verbum visibile*)"; he tells the people, "The bread which you see on the altar, sanctified by the Word of God (*per Verbum Dei*), is the Body of Christ."‖ The first two passages may perhaps suggest an epiclesis of the Logos as in Serapion (*inf.*). Another Western, St. Gaudentius of Brescia (*ob. c.* A.D. 427), may be the first writer, East or West, to set the two attributions of consecration side by side, but it is not quite clear that by "the Divine Spirit" he does not mean the Second Person.¶ With St. Gelasius and St. Fulgentius of Ruspe the Western recognition of consecration by the Spirit is complete, but it is curious to observe that the emphasis on the Words of Institution as consecratory is most marked in writers like St. Ambrose, St. Faustin of Riez, and St. Germanus, whose

* *De Bened. Patriar.*, 9. 38; P.L. 14. 719.

† *Missale Ambrosianum*, 1831, p. 142.

‡ Férotin, *Liber Mozarab. Sacrament.*, 200. I owe this illustration to Fr. A. W. S. Porter, C.R., who very kindly examined the Mozarabic formulæ for me.

§ *Missale Gallicanum. Vetus. ap.* Tommasi *Opp.*, Rome, 1751, vi., p. 375.

‖ *De Sacram. ad Infantes*, i. 3; P.L. 46. 834-6; *In Joann.* 80. 3; P.L. 35. 1840; *Serm.* 227; P.L. 38. 1099, etc.

¶ *Serm.* 2; P.L. 20. 858.

rite almost certainly *contained* an epiclesis of the Holy Ghost, as though they would insist on a traditional theology which their liturgy did not make entirely clear.

It seems clear that St. Ambrose did not initiate the "Western" theory of consecration. In essentials it is what St. Justin and St. Hippolytus called it, an "Apostolic Tradition" in the West.

(*b*) Cappadocians and Egyptians

A link between St. Irenæus and St. Basil in the tradition of Asia is St. Methodius of Olympus (martyred *c.* A.D. 310). From him comes the following: "The Church increases daily in greatness and beauty and multitude by the union and communion of the Word, who now still comes down (*συγκαταβαίνοντος*) to us and falls into a trance at the *anamnesis* of his Passion."*

Of the Cappadocians, St. Basil remarks that "the Son, and the Spirit, is (*sic*) the fount of sanctification."† What is surprising is that he never applies this idea to the Eucharist. In all that this leader of the war against the Macedonians ever wrote to uphold the Deity of the Holy Ghost there is not one suggestion that he consecrates the Eucharist. In his *De Spiritu Sancto* itself, in which Basil piles instance upon instance of the Spirit's sanctifying power and extols his operations in Baptism, he is entirely silent on this point, and has, indeed, a passage which suggests another theory of consecration. "Which of the Saints," he asks, "has left us in writing the words of the epiclesis at the consecration (*ἀναδειξει*) . . . ? For we are not content with what the Apostle or the Gospels record, for we add *before and after* other things as *having great importance* for the mystery."‡ For him the heart of the rite is still the Dominical Words.

St. Gregory Nazianzen and Cæsarius maintain the same silence on any operation of the Spirit in the Eucharist, though both were engaged in the struggle for the recognition of the Spirit's full Godhead. This silence is surely inexplicable if the Cappadocian rite then contained any formula analogous to that of Syria. Nazianzen suggests the Logos-theology when he asks St. Amphilochius for a remembrance at the altar, "whenever by a word thou drawest down the Word."§ St. Gregory of Nyssa, on the other hand, recognizes that as the Spirit

* *Sympos.*, 3. 8. † *Ep.*, 8. 2.

‡ *De S. S.*, 27. 66, *ὡς μεγάλην ἔχοντα πρὸς τὸ μυστήριον τὴν ἰσχύν*. "The Saints" = N.T. writers. "Epiclesis" appears to mean "consecration prayer" in general ("before and after"), a meaning which is probable also in the earlier Asiatics, Irenæus and Firmillian.

§ *Ep.*, 171; P.G. 37. 260.

hallows the font and the chrism, so he must have a part in the Eucharist.* Yet he puts forward the idea vaguely and with no illustration from the liturgy. It is Nyssen, indeed, who is explicit as to the formula which in this region was regarded as consecratory. "The bread . . . is instantly transformed (*εὐθυς μεταποιούμενος*) into the Body of the Word just as (*καθώς*) it is said by the Word, 'This is my Body.'"† Aquinas himself said no more.

It remains to look at Egypt. Consecration by the epiclesis of the Holy Ghost is clearly implicit in the present Syrianized Liturgy of St. Mark, and we have found it being taught in Egypt *c.* A.D. 400. But it is not the old Egyptian tradition. The epiclesis in the anaphora of St. Serapion (*c.* A.D. 360) runs: "O God of truth, may thy holy *Word* light upon this bread that it may become (*γένηται*) the Body of the Word, and upon this cup that the cup may become the Blood of the Truth." In the unique MS. this prayer is specially headed, "Of (=by) Serapion the Bishop," and whatever older material it contains, as it stands it is thoroughly fourth century in feeling. Its more theurgic tone is obvious when compared with Hippolytus. It presents the old theology on the very eve of transformation; the epiclesis of the Logos is clearly intended as consecratory, and expresses precisely the same idea as the Syrian epiclesis of the Spirit, but with a simpler and more obvious attribution. Serapion is important not as being primitive in its theology, but as representing the transition between the original conception and the later theological development. F. X. Funk has suggested‡ that the same ideas are visible in a fragment by St. Athanasius: "When the mighty prayer and holy entreaties have been sent up the Logos descends (*καταβαίνει*) upon the bread and the cup, and it becomes (*γίνεται*) his Body." Athanasius' successor, Peter II., speaks in A.D. 373 of "the very altar whereon we make the epiclesis for the descent of the Holy Spirit" (*ἔνθα κάθοδον τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπικαλοῦμεθα*).§ The idea of *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* descending *on to the altar* is quite different from simply changing the elements into the Body of Christ, but it is found in a great many writers *c.* 360-400 A.D.‖ It suggests again the transition from the period when *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* meant the Logos (to whom such an idea is applicable), to the true idea of "consecration by the Spirit," which it expresses very inadequately. If Peter meant by this phrase the Third Person,

* *De Bapt. Christi*, P.G. 46. 582; *cf. In Laud. fratris Bas., ibid.*, 805.

† *Orat. Cat.*, 37; P.G. 45. 97; *cf. ibid.*, 96: "I believe that the bread sanctified by the Word of God is transformed into the Body of God the Word," *τῷ Λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἁγιαζόμενον ἄρτον εἰς σῶμα τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου μεταποιεῖσθαι.*

‡ *Did. et Const. Apost.*, ii., p. 176, *n.* § *ap.* Theodoret, E. H., iv. 19.

‖ *E.g.*, Chrysostom, Ephraim, Optatus, *sup.*

it was not yet a commonplace of Egyptian theology. Nearly ten years later Didymus of Alexandria, the leading Egyptian theologian of the day, wrote his *De Trinitate*, of which Bk. II. is entirely devoted to the Holy Ghost. Though six whole chapters are given to his operation in Baptism, there is not one mention of the Eucharist. Didymus was the last of that great line which sat in the chair of Pantænus, and he held by the old Alexandrine Platonic thought. After him the new Syrian theology triumphed even in Egypt.

All this may be said fairly to raise the question whether a theology of eucharistic consecration on which Africa, Asia, Egypt, and Antiochene Syria were originally at one with second-century Rome and Gaul is properly termed the "Western Tradition."

IV.—THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE EPICLESIS

The acceptance of the full Personal and co-equal Godhead of the Holy Ghost by the Œcumenical Council of A.D. 381 put a sudden end to a hesitation between Binitarian and Trinitarian concepts visible in earlier Christian thought. In the long generation between Athanasius' *Letters to Serapion* and the Council this conflict had been open and vigorous. Every eminent orthodox writer of the period had at some time engaged in it, and proofs from the baptismal formula and even from old liturgical hymns like the Φῶς ἱλαρόν had been pressed for all, and even more than all, they were worth. What the defenders of a primitive universal epiclesis of the Spirit have to explain is why, with the single exception of St. Ambrose, who plainly held by another theology, no one of these controversialists ever refers to the eucharistic epiclesis. Had they known it, it must have provided artillery beside which hymns were as nothing. After 381 we find an immediate and general transference to the Holy Ghost of several attributions which earlier writers unhesitatingly make to the Logos. It is *now* that references to consecration by the Spirit multiply. In this case there was the old Logos=Spirit terminology to ease the transference, and the analogy with Baptism-Confirmation and Orders to strengthen the current of the times.

The important exception to the universality of the Logos theology before A.D. 350 is St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose *Catecheses* themselves suggest that he drew his theology of consecration from the implications of the liturgy of his own Church, an early form of "St. James." The Christology of this is definitely post-Nicene, and we have evidence that liturgical embellishment was going forward in Jerusalem *c.* A.D. 330 in the robe of gold

tissue sent by Constantine to its bishop Macarius as a vestment for the administration of Baptism.* St. Helen's visit had set the fashion of pilgrimage, and the new and splendid basilicas of her son must have combined with the influx of throngs of foreign worshippers to suggest the necessity of liturgical enrichments earlier at Jerusalem than elsewhere. It may thus be possible to carry back the rite of St. James, and with it the epiclesis, to about A.D. 330, but beyond that definite evidence fails us. It may represent a tradition taken over with whatever development from the pre-Constantinian rite of the city. Syrian liturgical traditions in other matters are abnormal (*e.g.*, in administering Confirmation *before* Baptism *without* imposition of hands), and a pre-occupation with the "pneumatic possession" of men and things can be traced back in the pagan folk-religion of Syria at least to about 1200 B.C. The only *known* precedents are gnostic, with definite affinities to pagan conceptions. However this may be, the epiclesis of the Spirit when we first meet it in "St. James" has been thoroughly Christianized. But there is one little point in "St. James" itself which suggests that the third-century Gentile Church of Ælia-Jerusalem was at one with Greek and Latin Christendom on this as on other matters. Its account of the Institution of the chalice runs: "He took the cup . . . and filled it with Holy Spirit (πλήσας πνεύματος ἁγίου), and gave it . . ." This is one of the expressions of Syrian texts (*e.g.*, Ephraim, *sup.*), which suggest that πνεῦμα ἅγιον, "Holy Spirit," is what is *received* in the Eucharist. With the previous discussion in mind I venture to suggest that in the Jerusalem liturgy as elsewhere πνεῦμα ἅγιον originally meant the *Logos*. The epiclesis in "St. James" would then be simply an earlier case of the same misunderstanding, or adaptation, of older language which we meet elsewhere.

The fact that the new liturgical development took its rise in Syria is important. In Church music and architecture, in the use of liturgical accessories like vestments and incense, in Biblical texts and scholarship, Syria was leading the world just then. It was even supplanting Egypt as the monastic model. When "spiky" nuns from the furthest West like Ætheria-Silvia were all agog to learn the liturgical customs of the Holy City, we need not wonder that Antiochenes and Alexandrians were affected by them. Above all, Constantinople, the mushroom capital with its self-assertive tendencies, had adopted a Syrian churchmanship from its foundation, and its influence eventually carried all before it in the East. With so much to aid them, Syrian customs could not fail to spread far and fast. And

* Theodoret, *E.H.*, ii. 27.

spread they did. It is quite possible that in the year 600 two Churches stood alone in Christendom in celebrating the Eucharist without any form of epiclesis, Rome—and Canterbury. This wide distribution may seem heavily against a purely Syrian origin for the epiclesis, but there is a weighty analogy. The MS. authority older than A.D. 1000 is, I suppose, in the region of at least twenty to one in favour of the *Textus Receptus* of the Gospels against all other texts. Yet no one seriously disputes that the T.R. is essentially a *Syrian* recension originating *c.* A.D. 300, which ousted the old local texts by Byzantine influence. With Serapion for B ℵ and the uninterpolated Hippolytus for D we have a very pretty parallel, and the Gospel text of Asia, like its liturgy, has perished. It is just the meagre *non*-Syrianized material in both cases which takes us back to authentic primitive tradition. And the "Western" tradition in both cases turns out to be not only "Western," but primitively "Eastern" as well.

The later history of the epiclesis is not without interest. While the theory of consecration by the Spirit and emphasis on the epiclesis progress steadily in the fifth and sixth centuries, St. John of Damascus (*ob.* A.D. 749), another Syrian, seems to be the first writer to say outright that the Words of Institution are *not* consecratory.* And the circumstances are peculiar. The Iconoclasts had a theory that the *consecrated* Sacrament was the only allowable "likeness" of Jesus Christ, and they found a proof of this in the description of the species as "antitypes of the Body and Blood" in the liturgy of St. Basil, *between* the Words of Institution and the epiclesis. Incidentally they reveal what formula was then taken for consecratory in the East. To short-circuit this argument Damascene asserts that the Words of Institution are *not* consecratory and the epiclesis *is*. Though repeated frequently in subsequent iconodule polemics, this *ad hoc* theology seems to have slumbered where this controversy was not in question. Neither side was aware of a difference on this point at the time of either the Photian or the Cærularian schism, and it was not raised at the reunion achieved by the Council of Lyons (1264). Writers of the dissident Eastern Churches continue to teach the "Western" doctrine down to the fifteenth century, and the Russian Church, founded from Constantinople, down to the seventeenth century. But after the fourth Crusade zealots like Cabasilas refurbished the doctrine of Damascene as a weapon against the Latins, and the question caused long debates at the Council of Florence. What is interesting is that at this Council the whole of the Russian and a minority of the Greek delegations sided with the Latins

* *De Fide Orthodoxa*, iv. 13; P.G. 94. 1152.

against the "Eastern" view, maintaining that the authentic Eastern tradition agreed with the West on this point. The first Russian edition of Moghila's catechism (1645) affirms the same doctrine, on which point subsequent editions have been emended. Since that date the Russian Church has come round to the Byzantine view, and at least one Russian theologian, Medviédeff, has paid with his life for defending the doctrine of St. John Chrysostom that the Words of Institution consecrate. The change of doctrine on this point remained one of the grievances of the "Old Believers." A long series of modern decisions, culminating in the *Responsum* of the Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople to Leo XIII. in 1894,* seems to have bound the theory of Damascene upon the Orthodox, but it would seem in truth to offer few of the characteristics of a genuine tradition, and to be Byzantine rather than properly Patristic or Primitive.

To sum up: It would seem that the primitive universal tradition of Christendom viewed the Eucharist as an operation of the Logos, often designated Holy "Spirit," and that the essential form, however regarded, consisted of some version of the formulæ recorded in the Gospels to this end. In the upshot the West has retained in substance the primitive theology and altered its terms, while the East has adhered to the terms and ended by discarding the theology. It may be said that the Eastern doctrine that the Holy Ghost consecrates the Sacrament is a possible restatement of the primitive view in terms of developed Trinitarian theology; but its *expression* in the epiclesis, particularly when this is regarded as the form of the Sacrament, has the unfortunate effect of casting doubt upon the validity all Eucharists celebrated before about A.D. 330. I would plead for a truce to the persistent suggestions that the rite of 1662 (I am defending it on this particular point) needs supplementing with an epiclesis, at least until the matter has been more adequately surveyed. It may well turn out to be not the least of the blessings of the events of 1927-28 that *Ecclesia Anglicana* was prevented from committing herself by a piece of false archæology to a practice as un-Scriptural and unprimitive as it is historically un-English.

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

* "The Church of the VII Œcumenical Councils, One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, was agreed that the holy oblations are consecrated after the prayer of the epiclesis of the Holy Spirit by the priestly benediction, as the ancient service books of Rome (?) and Gaul attest. But in this also the Papal Church has innovated in later days, etc."

THE SENSE OF THE PAST

A CHRISTOLOGICAL SPECULATION

"To sleep, is manifestly human . . . to rebuke the tempest and lay the surging waves, is without question divine." So writes St. Leo in his Tome, in the middle of the fifth century. The implied Christology is generally acknowledged to be obsolete. But the difficulty remains. Common-sense explanations of the miracle, as that the boat presently reached the shelter of a cliff, can be disregarded, for they do not affect the problem: What manner of man was this who, *as man*, expected the waves to subside in obedience to a command from His lips? In what sense can we take as a pattern one who acted as Canute in the story refused to act, who behaved in a way which, if anyone else were in question, would be deemed fanatical? The present essay is an attempt to restate the traditional Christology, of which St. Leo is so clear an exponent.

I

The Chalcedonian Definition has been termed the bankruptcy of Greek theology, because it states the problem without solving it. Certainly "One and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, without confusion, without conversion, without division, never to be separated; the distinction of natures being in no wise done away because of the union, but rather the characteristic property of each nature being preserved, and concurring into one Person and one subsistence (*hypostasis*) . . ." comes as rather a shock to the modern educated man, who has never thought along these lines. The value of the Definition becomes clearer when we remember two things: first, the "one and the same Christ" is the Self, the creative centre of the personality—this is the Logos, the eternal Son; secondly, in an age which naturally thinks in terms of psychology, the two natures for practical purposes are two consciousnesses—not that "nature" and "consciousness" are equivalent terms, but, starting as we do from the Gospel record, we tend to disregard abstracts like "divine" and "human" natures and to concentrate on their historical manifestation in the form of consciousness. One cause of the unpopularity of the Definition has doubtless been the tendency of philosophy to doubt the validity of the conception of the Self. With the return of Idealism this prejudice ought to pass. A little will be said on this subject later. The

main purpose of the essay, however, is to discuss the consciousness of the Incarnate Word.

The two chief problems are these:

1. In what sense is it conceivable that the Logos, incarnate in Jesus Christ, continued to exercise cosmic functions?

2. Can we postulate any divine consciousness in Christ which would not destroy His true humanity, besides doing violence to the Gospel record?

1. It would really be sufficient to reply that this side of the mystery is inevitably veiled from our gaze, so that no good purpose is served by discussing it. But so long as our hymn-books contain verses like

> Those mighty hands that rule the sky
> No earthly toil refuse;
> The Maker of the stars on high
> An humble trade pursues,

the clergy should be prepared with some words, some faint analogies, to justify their use. The following illustrations have given some kind of an answer to church-goers who have been tempted to deem the language of devotion irrational.

(*a*) Imagine a saint wrapped in devotion suddenly called upon to fight a fire. For an hour or more he is wholly absorbed in the task of saving life and property. The danger passes and he returns to his prayer-desk. Is there any cessation of his communion with God during the intervening time? Does he not, like Wordsworth's child, lie in Abraham's bosom all day long?

Extending this thought—does not the modern emphasis on the Unconscious enable us to imagine mental activity outside the field of consciousness?

(*b*) A business man has created a business. Every detail of it is familiar to him. His spirit permeates the everyday behaviour of the staff and their reaction to new problems. One day he is in his office, brooding over difficulties, but not seen by his subordinates. The next day he does not come to work. The business on the two days runs along precisely as usual; present or absent, he is equally immanent in it (*Secundum hominem dico . . . Utinam sustineretis modicum quid insipientiæ meæ* !).

(*c*) In a quite extraordinary way modern scientific philosophy has brought back "man as the measure of things." The astronomer who measures the stars in his tiny brain is rightly regarded as the superior of the stars. We cannot conceive (without the hypothesis of God) what reality could be apart from the human percipient, who, if he does not create the

objective world, at least gives it coherence. It no longer seems absurd to suppose that Jesus of Nazareth, on a side of His nature veiled from us, was exercising cosmic functions.*

2. I have no intention of entering the field of modern Christological discussion; but a few references to representative theologians will prepare the way for the following sections. Bishop Gore's treatment in his Bampton Lectures and the accompanying *Dissertations* (1895) is very strong and sane, but the particular problem we are considering is hardly mentioned. Bishop Frank Weston in *The One Christ* (1907) supposes a continuously exercised act of self-limitation. The Logos "wills to have no consciousness of Himself that is not mediated for Him by His human soul." "He willed so to relate Himself to the Father and to man that within these relationships He could not know Himself as unlimited Son of God." But does not this practically give up the idea of any but a human consciousness ?† Canon Hodgson in *And was Made Man* (1928) writes of Jesus as "looking out on the world with the mind of God"; ideas "present themselves to Him . . . through what we may call ordinary human channels."‡ "His mind was *naturally* at home in the heavenly places." Once more, does this description necessarily suggest more than a very holy man, so far as the mode of consciousness is concerned ?§

Dr. Sanday's *Christologies Ancient and Modern* (1910) attracted a good deal of attention as a bold attempt to use the New Psychology in the service of Christology. This was as desirable as it was inevitable. But the particular theory he championed has not commended itself to scholars. Such statements as "the . . . subliminal consciousness is the proper seat or *locus* of the Deity of the Incarnate Christ"; "those lower deeps which are no less the proper and natural home of whatever is divine"; and "this [human] consciousness was, as it were, the narrow neck through which alone the divine could come to expression,"‖ seem today almost perverse. Spatial metaphors like sub- and supra-liminal are ill-fitted to describe the dwelling together of divine and human.¶ After all, we

* Bishop Weston (*The One Christ*, p. 116 f.) uses the illustration of a priest's knowledge as a man and his knowledge as a confessor, which, however, is not very well suited to his theory.

† Pp. 156-9. Though "unlimited" leaves a loophole. ‡ Pp. 32, 36.

§ On a theory of reincarnation, if one of us lived again he would presumably have no memory of his former life, but his character and conduct would be affected by it. There is a tendency to explain the consciousness of the Incarnate Word somewhat along this line. ‖ Pp. 159, 166-7.

¶ A thoughtful American writer, W. S. Bishop, asks: "May we not say that the consciousness of our Lord has its higher and lower levels—the higher level of Divinity and the lower level of humanity ?" (*Spirit and Personaltiy*, p. 25). Again we get the spatial division of consciousness; but "higher level" is better fitted to describe the divine than is "*sub*-conscious."

know the subconscious best from dreams, which hardly suggest the divine. As Professor Pratt says, what is highest "in the religious genius is to be sought in his conscious state rather than in some form of insensibility. . . . It is difficult to see why God should choose to communicate with a split-off complex . . . rather than with the man himself."*

Dr. H. M. Relton's thesis, *A Study in Christology* (1917), deserves its remarkable sale and continuing influence. His purpose is to reach the truth after which Apollinarianism strove, by the help of Leontius of Byzantium's doctrine of the Enhypostasia, the presupposition of which "is the existence of such an affinity between the human and the Divine as to make the advent of the latter into the former not the advent of some alien element. . . ."† He speaks, very much as Bishop Weston, of "a single Divine self-consciousness conditioned in and by manhood, God in manhood becoming conscious of Himself only so far and in the measure in which such knowledge can be mediated by His manhood." "He knows Himself . . . as God the Son limited and conditioned in manhood; and unable to act or speak or think outside the limits imposed upon Him by His manhood."‡ "The Divine Logos was capable of being the Ego, not only of His Divine but also of His human Nature; because His personality in virtue of its Divinity already embraced all that is most distinctive of a true human personality."§ This doctrine "secures for the Christ in His Incarnate state a range of consciousness passing out beyond the limits of a finite mind."‖ This theory alone allows us to speak of two natures but one single consciousness, so its expounder claims.

Above,¶ Dr. Relton has explained that we speak now of consciousness where the Fathers speak of nature—clearly a fertile source of misunderstanding and even of "formal" heresy.**

This brief survey has been confined to representative Anglican theologians, who try to be loyal to Chalcedon. It is sufficient to shew that one who tries to maintain any form of dual consciousness is out of sympathy with the modern Anglican theology.

II

Those who think that the refinements of Greek dogmatic controversy were a sad waste of intellectual activity may be reminded that the disputes about the Natures of Christ at least

* J. B. Pratt, *The Religious Consciousness*, p. 106. † P. 147. ‡ Pp. 216-7.
§ P. 227; this will be criticized later. ‖ P. 233. ¶ P. 130.
** I have tried to say the same thing guardedly at the beginning of the essay. "Two Natures" is the orthodox phraseology, but "two consciousnesses" sounds Nestorian.

led to a deepened conception of human personality. And the fuller knowledge of the workings of the mind gained in modern times has in its turn thrown light on the mystery of the Incarnation. Psychology, especially, has raised problems which cannot be neglected, and, whatever we may think of Dr. Sanday's pioneer attempt at a solution, it is clear that some attempt to use the New Psychology had to be made. There is, however, another department of modern knowledge which so far has been neglected by theologians. I refer to the wonderful insight into the springs of human action and the subtleties of mental experience which belongs to certain outstanding novelists. I am thinking, not of some novelists' re-writing of the Life of Jesus without attempting to master the elements of the problem, but rather of a delicate intuition into the workings of the mind and of a power of delineation which are surely something new in our generation, and which presumably tell us something fresh about the humanity taken by the Word. The novel is the characteristic literary form of our day and has something to contribute to theological method.

The particular novel I have in mind is Henry James' *The Sense of the Past*, which is as truly a psychological masterpiece as any of the works of William James. If Dr. Sanday could without offence re-interpret the doctrine of the Incarnation in the light of psychologists like William James, a novel of Henry James may be studied with the purpose of illustrating the same subject. About one-third only of the book was finished; for the rest we have the author's notes on the proposed plot, which reveal the secrets of "the craft of fiction" in a delightful manner.

1. Ralph Pendrel, a well-to-do New Yorker, aged about thirty, inherits an old house in a London square from a distant English relative.* He is an imaginative man, who lives largely in the past, and he delights in the house, which is a perfect example of the style of 1710. At first his full possession is limited by its being let furnished to a Mrs. Midmore, of Drydown, in Hampshire. However, she does not appear in this part of the story, and the hero is able to go and live in the house. There he is confronted by a remarkable picture representing a young man in the dress of 1820, who has *his* face. As he sits brooding in the house, the young man comes out of the picture. The novelist leaves what follows to the reader's imagination. The next stage is Pendrel's visit to the American Ambassador, who receives him with the utmost courtesy; though the explanation "I'm not myself; I'm somebody else" is startling. Pendrel says that he and his prototype of 1820

* Mansfield Square; the plot of the play *Berkeley Square* is derived from the novel.

(apparently an ancestor) have arranged to exchange identities. The man of 1820 is, it seems, a ghost, for no one sees him except Pendrel. The point of contact is his intense yearning for the future, which meets Pendrel's yearning for the past and makes the exchange possible. The Ambassador sees Pendrel home and leaves him as he mounts the steps of the house in Mansfield Square and *enters the year* 1820.

So far the story, beautifully told though it is, differs little from similar fictional narratives.

2. Ralph Pendrel now *is* his ancestor just arrived from America. He has "the faint odd brush of a suggestion" that he is familiar with the house, and an impression of stepping into a chapter of another story than his own. He is shown into a room where he finds Molly Midmore, his cousin, to whom (so he knows by intuition) he is to make love. He begins at once. Ralph's father, Molly explains, has written to put a family misunderstanding right. (Ralph has been learning very fast, and his blunders are attributed to American rawness.) "Once more . . . he knew the flood of consciousness within him to raise its level." He improvises and makes no more mistakes as he talks, though the letters between him and Molly have gone from his memory; the other sister, "Sweet Nan," is mentioned, but he has to confess that he had forgotten her. An unexpected "visitation" leads him to mention a former love (belonging to New York of 1910). Mrs. Midmore comes in and then Perry, Molly's commonplace brother. Ralph talks marvellously and has such a feeling of enlargement and elation that the other life has gone. With all his attractiveness there is something puzzling. Perry is "affrighted" at an incalculable element in him; Mrs. Midmore has a "strange long look," a "questioning fear." Presently Nan arrives, plain and weak in comparison with Molly; but an inward cry is torn from him as they meet—"Why, she's modern, *modern*!" So sympathetic are they that by a kind of clairvoyance he knows of a broken vase in the country home which is distressing Nan. The things in him which warn the others off draw her to him.

3. Here the story stops and we are dependent for the remainder on Henry James' notes of the plot. Ralph is absent for six months.* During that time there is a slow growth of fear of him, "as abnormal, as uncanny," on the part of the others. They begin the malaise, not he. But his revulsion increases. He is "*almost* as right as possible for the 'period,' and yet so intimately and secretly wrong." His "refinement" strikes them, "though he tries to conceal it, to dissimulate it." This very effort at concealment makes him appear "clever"

* Nothing is said about the behaviour of the man of 1820 in 1910 surroundings.

beyond anything they have ever dreamed of. He on his side is repelled by the brutalities of that generation—their economies, hard discipline, class rigour, and the extraordinary readiness of everyone to profit by his pecuniary favours. At this stage James' perception reaches its splendid best. "Enormous as the assimilation may be, it is not absolutely perfect . . . (there is) this wavering margin, this occurrence of spots and moments." He is "at the same time watching himself . . . being both the other man and not the other man." "This concomitant, this watchful and critical, living in his 'own' self inevitably grows and grows from a certain moment on," helped by "the malaise on the part of the others."

4. The crisis develops rapidly. As the original self "conquers so much of the ground," anguish gets fuller possession of it. He is terrified at the thought of being married to Molly and locked up "in *that* form of the Past." Molly breaks off the match because she is afraid of him. He has really been designed for Nan, but the elder sister has annexed him. As his friendship with Nan develops, she realizes that beneath his fineness there is something to pity. Finally he reveals himself to her, since the sense of his other world has come back in a great wave. He returns to 1910, drawn back by his own yearning and by the love of his New York friend of the twentieth century.

III

Has the reader detected what startled me in the novel, that the four sections into what I have divided the plot correspond to the stages of the Incarnate Life depicted in the Gospels?

1. The yearning which preceded the taking flesh in another sphere.

2. The enthusiastic reception of one who spoke like no one else.

3. The revulsion of "this generation" from the stranger and his growing inability to fit himself into its framework.

4. The revelation of himself to his own, to the one who was spiritually akin to his world, followed by his withdrawal from the eyes of that generation caused by the yearning of love on both sides.

Probably no such analogy ever entered the head of Henry James. That it is possible to draw it at all leads me to wonder whether there is not an inevitable "pattern" which must recur in every sincere attempt to think out the conditions of any kind of "incarnation."

Let us now give a brief summary of the three stages of the life of Christ as depicted in the Gospels, reserving (1) for the present, a discussion of the actual taking flesh of the Word.

(2) "They were all amazed" (Mark i. 27, ii. 12) will stand as a summary of the first impression made by Jesus. To His friends He seemed "possessed" by some higher power (iii. 22).* His disciples "feared exceedingly" when He stilled the storm—not the obvious reaction to a great deliverance. Once more, in v. 42 and vi. 51, they are "amazed." St. John's statement, that they wished to make this King among men a veritable King, is, if not an authentic tradition, at least a true interpretation of the earliest record. Especially were they "astonished at his teaching" (Matt. vii. 28); never spake one like this man.

(3) The divisions appear in broad outline only; the three stages overlap and shade into one another. The clash with "this generation" begins in Mark iii.—the "anger, being grieved at the hardening of their heart" (*v.* 5), and the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (*v.* 29). It reaches a climax in ix. 19, "O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I bear with you?" and in Luke xii. 50, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened (*συνέχομαι*) till it be accomplished!"

(4) The final stage of revelation to "His own" of His abiding contact with a higher world is reached in the Transfiguration story.

If St. John's Gospel is an accurate record of the words of Jesus, He was fully conscious of pre-existence. Thus, "I speak the things which I have seen with my Father" (viii. 38); "Before Abraham was, I am" (*v.* 58); "I came out from the Father, and am come into the world" (xvi. 28); "Glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (xvii. 5). But these passages do not necessarily mean more than that the Evangelist, having identified Jesus with the pre-existent Logos (in Philo's sense)† in the Prologue, in the body of the Gospel gives concrete expression to his doctrine. It is safer to hold that St. John is giving (a true) interpretation of the hints found in the earlier Gospels.

IV

All thinking about the mode of the Incarnation is devout speculation. Provided this is made clear, can we imagine the Incarnation better than as a divine yearning on the part of God for union with man answered in the fullness of time by a yearning from the side of man strong and pure enough to enable God, who wills to respect man's freedom, to fulfil His desire? This is the interpretation of St. Paul, for whom "that rock,"

* This seems to convey the sense of *ἐξέστη*.

† Or the pre-existent Son of Man of Enoch xlviii.

which gave living waters to the fathers in the wilderness, "was Christ" (1 Cor. x. 4). Something of the kind was in the mind of the later writers, or editors, of the Old Testament, who seem to have changed Yahweh, who appeared to certain characters, into the Angel of Yahweh. Thus the Angel of the LORD in Exod. iii. 2 is clearly identical with the LORD of iv. and vii. And the Angel of the LORD in Judges xiii. is described as "a man of God" (*v.* 6) and "God" (*v.* 22). According to one interpretation, the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel teaches this definitely. "He (the Logos) was the true light . . . coming into the world. He came unto his own (*i.e.*, the world made by him), and they that were his own received him not"* (*vv.* 9-11). The Logos, that is, was with men, especially with the Hebrew people, continually coming, but unable to realize His heart's desire. At last in the "Remnant," the holy and humble men of heart depicted in the Infancy chapters of St. Luke, an answering yearning appeared. In a sense the response was racial rather than individual—"Israel is my Son"; however pure and holy the Virgin Mary was, she was what she was by virtue of her training and environment as much as of her personal endowments. Indeed, it would be contrary to the deepest thought of the New Testament to teach that Mary was chosen because of her merit. Still, just because, with all the immaturity of a young girl, she represented most perfectly the simplicity and receptiveness of her circle, she became literally the "Portal of the world's salvation," the door through which the Logos entered humanity. If any such imagery appeals to us as a fitting vehicle for religious truth, it becomes exceedingly difficult to reject the Virgin Birth, which rejection involves connecting the birth of the Saviour with the ordinary process of human desire.

We are now in a position to criticize Dr. Relton's thesis referred to above. What is this abstract humanity which was already possessed by the Logos before the Incarnation? We only know human personality as expressed in concrete persons. But if the theory could be directed towards the implications of the Logos immanent in the Hebrew people, and especially in the Remnant, it would fall into line with a line of thought prominent in the New Testament.

V

If the pattern of James' book served us in mapping out the stages of the ministry of the Incarnate Son, are we too bold

* In this interpretation the Incarnation is first mentioned in *v.* 14. Verses 12, 13 will refer to the pious remnant who in a measure did receive Him.

when we use his description of the consciousness of Ralph Pendrel as a guide when we read once more the Markan story? If not, we can take his words, inevitably subtle as they are in order to express so strange a conception, as a possible description of what we want—two natures, divine and human, with one divine centre of personality, and one dual consciousness, *not* two consciousnesses in juxtaposition. Recall his words: "This wavering margin, this occurrence of spots and margins." "Watching himself . . . being both the other man and not the other man." "This concomitant, this watchful and critical, living in his 'own' self." The consciousness is present from the first, but from a certain point grows rapidly until the *dénouement*.

The opening verses of St. Mark shew us the two poles* in the consciousnesss of Jesus. "Thou art my beloved Son" (i. 11) is the first. Probably this consciousness was racial to begin with. The child Jesus realized His sonship as a member of the chosen race and heir of the promises. The conviction became unalterably clear at the Baptism. The bitter experience of life forced upon Him the knowledge that He was not as other men; no one else had this Sonship. The Remnant was narrowed down to one, so that He could say: "No one knoweth . . . the Father, save the Son, and (the new Israel that was being formed) he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him" (Matt. xi. 27); and "the Kingdom of God is in the midst of you," in the person of the Son (Luke xvii. 21).

The other pole in His consciousness is seen in the proclamation of the Kingdom (Mark i. 15). This pole, it seems to me, is a divine consciousness. Given His humanity, a knowledge of being wholly on God's side had to take the form of an overwhelming conviction of the presence of God's Ruling, with which necessarily were connected the thought-forms of Jewish eschatology.

As the Ministry proceeded, the "Kingdom" manifested itself ever more powerfully. At the Transfiguration it broke through. After that, Jesus strode on ahead, going up to Jerusalem, knowing that death awaited Him. Only so could the Kingdom prevail. The purely human Jesus could not have said "after three days he shall rise again" (Mark x. 34).† This is the intuition of the divine pole of His consciousness, which in Mark xiv. 61, 62 ("Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" "I am; and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven") is perfectly fused with the consciousness of Sonship.

* I suggest this modern metaphor, realizing that, if *per impossibile* it had been used in the fifth century, it might have led to a fresh crop of excommunications.

† Critical commentaries generally treat this as *vaticinium post eventum*.

VI

Granted that our Lord possessed this wider consciousness, which we have termed divine—may it not equally well be a faculty of the human mind as such? We bring three witnesses to attest the existence of such a faculty—a poet, a philosopher, and a mathematical psychologist.

1. Wordsworth is the greatest of the poets who expound Nature-mysticism. "We feel that we are greater than we know" is his summing up of teaching which pervades his poems. In *Tintern Abbey* we read of

> a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean, and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
> . . . . . Therefore am I still
> A lover of the meadows and the woods,
> . . . . . of all the mighty world
> Of eye and ear, both what they half create,
> And what perceive.

2. Dr. W. R. Matthews with enviable lucidity has told us of the reappearance of the Self in the new Idealism. "I can never be, at the same moment, both subject and object, both the knower and the known. The ultimate agent in the act of knowing, the subject in the last analysis must remain, it appears, unknown. . . . Thus we reach the conception of an Ego or Self which is 'beyond time,' which is timeless in the sense that it is not produced by the temporal process, but is rather the condition of there being any temporal process. . . . We are led to the thought of a creative core of the self which is beyond time."*

3. Mr. J. W. Dunne in *An Experiment with Time* has the same idea of an ultimate observer who thinks the sentence "I am I" (*Je suis moi* brings out the meaning in a way impossible in English). But he makes a striking contribution of his own. In the waking consciousness the observer is limited by the brain and the realm of space-time. In dreams he is in a measure detached from his experience, which he criticizes and interprets often knowing that he is dreaming. He is not tied down to the associations formed in his brain by past experience, but transcends the limits fixed by the physical configurations of the brain.† So the Self beyond time, which is logically constructed by the philosophers, is discovered at work by Mr. Dunne.

To the Christian the simplest explanation of these facts, none the less real because they cannot be measured or described

* *Essays in Construction*, pp. 212-3.

† The book brings strong evidence to prove this. May we not suppose that the dreams of Jesus brought Him strength and refreshment?

by science, is that we are indwelt by the Logos, and therefore on one side of our being are beyond time and space. But the analogy with the consciousness of Jesus breaks down. There is no evidence to shew that He had any cosmic emotion in the Wordsworthian sense. Sun, birds and flowers alike moved for Him within the orbit of the Fatherhood of God—at least, that is the impression derived from the Sermon on the Mount. The consciousness which we deduce from the Gospels is in line with that of other men, for the Logos indwells them as well as Him, but in Him the Logos has taken flesh, and *is* the creative centre of the personality. Consciousness in Him therefore is qualitatively rather than quantitatively different.

We return to the question with which we started. It has been asked, What other than human consciousness is conceivable which would not destroy true humanity? Henry James has shewn that such a consciousness *can* be conceived—that is all I claim—as being compatible with a true humanity, though inevitably producing a mal-adjustment with the environment, such as is actually recorded of Jesus. (Wordsworth's "sense sublime" produced a feeling of perfect union with the environment.)* When Jesus rebuked the waves it was with a consciousness, surely divine and not human, that He was their lord.†

These are not barren subtleties with which we have been concerned. "Now we are the sons of God . . . we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him." The mysteries of our perfected sonship, manifested in heightened personality, appear dimly as we contemplate our Saviour. And even in this life, by faith and sacramentally, there comes to pass an interpenetration between Him and us, on which a sincere discussion of Christological problems may throw light.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

* Though, of course, Wordsworth for the most part avoided the disturbing contact with his fellow men.

† This does not exclude the possibility that the fulfilment of the intuition lay in the immediate neighbourhood of calm water, but does exclude the suggestion that, knowing the danger about to cease from natural causes, He acted a part to impress the disciples.

MISCELLANEA

LICENSING CONFESSORS

SIXTY years ago the subject of appointing selected priests for the special work of hearing Confessions was brought before the Bishops in the Upper House of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. It came before them in the form of a petition presented by a number of the clergy. The petitioners asked "that in view of the widespread and increasing use of Sacramental Confession, your venerable House may consider the advisability of providing for the education, selection, and licensing of duly qualified Confessors, in accordance with the provisions of Canon Law."*

This petition bore the signatures of 483 priests, was read by His Grace the President of the Upper House in the year 1873, and became the subject of prolonged discussion. The discussion displayed an almost unanimous anxiety to restrict Confession within extremely narrow limits.

With regard to appointing Confessors, opinions were sharply divided. Some held that the selection of Confessors had become a necessity, but thought that some check ought to be put upon persons constituting themselves Confessors to a whole neighbourhood. Some considered that "no person ought to be allowed to receive Confession without a licence." Some felt that the practical difficulty of dealing with the question was great. An attempt to put down Confession might injure the consciences of those who, being burdened, absolutely need the relief which God had provided in His Church. Yet to regulate would encourage what they desired to restrain. If His Grace would lay down a line of conduct on which they could all unite, it would be a very great blessing to the Church. The Primate, however, declared that he had formerly felt obliged to cancel a curate's licence in this matter of Confession; and that if any young man in a curacy were to fall into similar objectionable practices, he would think it his duty to revoke his licence, as he did in the case already referred to. At the same time it was felt invidious to exercise over curates a discipline which it was impossible to exercise over incumbents. The debate ended in a unanimous agreement to refer the matter to a Committee of the whole House. And there to all appearance the subject expired, and was duly buried. In the atmosphere prevalent both within the Church and outside it sixty years ago that was as much as could be expected.

Since 1873 the subject of licensing Confessors appears to have received very little official consideration. In the Conference on Confession and Absolution appointed by the Bishop of London, and held at Fulham Palace in 1901, the special training of ministers for this work was placed upon the agenda, but omitted from the discussion, in spite of the fact that attention was called to the omission by members of the Conference.

The proposal to select Confessors is based on the well-known theological distinction between Orders and Jurisdiction: between the power to minister, conferred in ordination, and the conditions under which that power should be exercised.

This distinction between the possession of power and the limitations imposed upon the use of it is recognized at once in the case of a Bishop.

* *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1873, p. 367.

A Bishop at his consecration receives the power to ordain, but may not exercise that power outside the limits of his own Diocese without an authority beyond his own. Nor can he exercise the power to ordain after he has resigned his See, unless he has received express permission from those still holding official place. A similar restriction applies to a Bishop's power to consecrate others to the Episcopate. He may never exercise that power without the consent of the Church. Both the power of ordaining priests, and of consecrating Bishops, are subject to limitations of jurisdiction. History contains notorious instances of irregularities committed in the exercise of jurisdiction, and of the evil consequences resulting to the Church.

This distinction between Orders and jurisdiction applies also to the *functions of a priest*. Strictly speaking, although he has received ministerial power, yet he has no right without permission, either tacit or expressed, to discharge his functions as a priest beyond the Diocese to which he is attached. He cannot take temporary charge of a parish in another Diocese without the Diocesan's consent. Restrictions can be imposed upon his exercise of his unquestionable powers. He can be suspended from any exercise of them, or deprived of the right altogether.

Now this right to impose limitations on the jurisdiction of a priest applies *to the ministry of Absolution*. It is true that no restriction is imposed in the Book of Common Prayer. The familiar sentence, "let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word," leaves the individual penitent free to go to whom he will, and implies an obligation on the part of any priest to undertake if invited this special ministry. Pusey's well-known comment is that "the Church of England leaves her children free to whom to open their griefs." That would be generally acknowledged to be above dispute.

At the same time the nature of this ministry has to be remembered. The ministry of Absolution is, of course, *a sacramental ministry*. The Absolution conferred depends in no degree whatever on the abilities of the individual priest who pronounces it. He is nothing more than the visible agent of the true invisible Absolver. The Absolution is effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, and is in no way affected by the priest's personal limitations.

But the ministry of Absolution is not only a sacramental ministry. It is a *judicial ministry* as well. The Confessor is required to pronounce decision. The responsibility rests with him of determining whether Absolution can or cannot in the circumstances before him be given, or deferred, or refused.

Moreover, this ministry is for spiritual counsel and advice. No doubt the Confessor's work as an adviser is distinct from that of general guidance and direction. The Spiritual Director and the Confessor may be, and often have been, different priests. Spiritual letters of direction have constantly been given to persons whose confessions the Director does not hear. But a ministry which is expressly declared to include spiritual counsel and advice is, and must be, greatly affected by the qualities of the individual priest. He is liable to be called on for advice and counsel in moral problems of the utmost delicacy. And it depends in part on his knowledge of the principles of Christian conduct, on his capacity to disentangle the intricacies of the human conscience, on his gifts of sympathy, his insight and his discretion, whether he is really adapted for this most serious duty. Is it not true to say that there are priests peculiarly

qualified for this ministry and there are priests who are not? There are diversities of gifts. And the question is whether the individual priest is better left to decide for himself where his gifts may lie, or whether he is not better helped and guided by the discernment of others in the Church.

There are in a Diocese priests who, in the judgment of their fellow clergy and in the discernment of their ecclesiastical superiors, are eminently fitted for this most delicate and difficult part of priestly ministration. It is surely most desirable that priests who are both by nature and grace peculiarly qualified for this sacred duty should be definitely and openly encouraged by their superiors to undertake it.

There is also another consideration. While it is ideally the pastoral privilege of the priest entrusted with cure of souls to minister to all the spiritual needs of his people, yet his people are expressly left free to decide for themselves who their Confessor shall be; and many prefer to make their Confession to a priest with whom they do not work. They would far rather go to a stranger. Their very regard for their own priest may sometimes increase their reserve, and their reluctance to make him their Confessor. It is even possible that, for that very reason, the relief of Confession and Absolution may be prevented. Difficulties of this kind do not arise in the great centres of population. In the towns and cities there is frequent room for the penitent to choose. But in country places there is not. In such cases the occasional visit of a priest specially authorized for this ministry would be to many a reserved and anxious soul a blessing. There are certainly missioners well qualified for such ministry. There are priests within our religious Communities who might, to the great spiritual gain of souls, be openly commended for this special ministry of consolation.

Then there is the case of the newly ordained. It will be generally agreed that for a young priest to begin at once to hear Confessions is altogether undesirable. Yet practically this is often left more or less to his own discretion, although sometimes regulated by the directions of his Vicar. But the case ought not to depend merely on an individual incumbent's advice.

Some thoughtful reflections were made upon this matter thirty years ago in the *Church Quarterly Review*. A warning note was raised. It was suggested that: "If we have been comparatively free from scandals, thanks are due to Providence . . . but not to our haphazard way of letting every priest, young or old, learned or ignorant, impetuous or discreet, receive Confessions. . . . This is a matter for our rulers in the Church. . . . The matter is by no means an easy one. The training which is required for a Confessor is more than the study of a scholastic manual of moral theology. A standard of age cannot be fixed, for one man is competent at thirty, another still incompetent at sixty; though it would be beneficial if Bishops or incumbents would restrain very young men from this ardous ministry. . . ."*

It went on to recommend that a Bishop should designate certain persons as eminently skilled for the purpose.

The practice of Confession has extended enormously in the English Church during the last thirty years. But singularly little attention has been given to such warnings and suggestions as those of the *Church Quarterly Review*. The ministry of Absolution occupies in the Roman Church a different and far more systematic place than that which it

* *C.Q.R.*, 1903, vol. lv., p. 320.

occupies in the Anglican. And for that very reason the Roman authorities have been constrained to bestow conspicuous care on the limits of jurisdiction. Ever since the Council of Trent* it has been the Roman rule that a priest must not pronounce Absolution upon a person over whom he has not either an ordinary or a delegated jurisdiction. There are cases reserved to his superiors, although in cases of approaching death all priests may absolve all penitents whatsoever from every kind of sin.

It must be acknowledged that there is need of regulating jurisdiction within the English Church. Deliberate reflection on this subject is considerably overdue. If 483 priests were prepared to petition Convocation to approve the selection of Confessors in 1873, we may well reflect what number of clergy would approve a similar petition in 1934. The atmosphere, either within the council chambers of the Church or in the world outside, some sixty years ago was not conducive to impartial deliberation on a matter such as this. It was a time in which a Primate could declare that the petitioners would be only too pleased if they could entrap the Bishops into giving any sort of approbation to it. The change that has passed over the English Church since those days is simply marvellous. Has not the time arrived when authority is able sympathetically to regulate and direct, and secure from needless irregularities, what it is quite impossible to suppress?

Very memorable directions on this subject are given by the Bishop of Ripon in his *Diocesan Gazette* for February, 1934:

"It is recognized (1) that admission to a benefice carries with it the right and duty to hear Confessions, when so desired, in accordance with the invitation in the Communion Office; and (2) that any priest may have to hear a Confession in an emergency. But in other Churches mere admission to priest's orders does not confer the right to invite confessions, this being conferred by the Bishop's licence on those deemed to be qualified. In general accord with several other English Bishops, who have consulted together, the Bishop of the Diocese proposes until further notice to act in this matter as follows:

"1. Normally an unbeneficed priest will not be authorized in this Diocese to hear Confessions as a regular part of his ministry till he has completed three years from his ordination as priest.

"2. Every such priest will be required to pursue an appropriate course of study under a supervisor, who shall satisfy himself that he is a fit person, and has qualified to the best of his abilities, before recommending him to the Bishop for authorization."

Directions such as these indicate a deep consciousness of the need for the selection of authorized Confessors, and go some real way towards remedying defects. It will be noted that these directions are only for a single Diocese, and are provisional "until further notice." In a matter so grave, and affecting the ministry of Absolution in every part of the English Church, it is only right to plead that this is a matter which the entire Episcopate collectively should regulate, and that directions should issue from the constitutional organ of the Church's self-expression—namely, the sacred synods of the English Church. Regulations issued by the Provincial Councils will have a weight and authority which they alone can give.

W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON.

* Session XIV., Cap. VII.

TE DEUM LAUDAMUS

Two notes on the *Te Deum* which have appeared recently in THEOLOGY seem to call for some comment. In January, 1930, the Rev. G. H. Whitaker gave us a fresh translation based upon the assumption that the whole hymn is addressed to Christ, for which he advanced two grounds: that *æternum patrem* is a title for Our Lord taken from Isaiah ix. 6, and that *tuum* after *uenerandum* is a manifest interpolation.

I

With regard to the first point, to the best of my knowledge no Latin version translates, nor does any Latin Father quote the phrase in that form. Moreover, the words occur elsewhere with undoubted reference to the First Person of the Blessed Trinity.

(*a*) The hymn of St. Ambrose *Intende qui regis Israel*, line 25:

æqualis æterno Patri
carnis tropæo accingere,
infirma nostri corporis
uirtute firmans perpeti.

(*b*) Probably also in the hymn *Christe, cæli Domine*, where line 9 reads:

tu uerbum Patris æterni
ore diuino editus.

There is another reading, *æterne*, in two ninth-century MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris: Lat. 528, a Benedictine Collectarium from St. Martial, Limoges, and Lat. 14088, also a Ben. Collectarium, from St. Germain-des-Près.

(*c*) After the *Te Deum* in the *Liber Hymnorum* in both MSS. (Trinity College, Dublin, and the Franciscan Library) there follows an antiphon—at least, Bernard and Atkinson call it such—which also appears in the Bangor Antiphonary in another position (f. 35^{R}) headed *Post Laudate pueri dominum in dominicorum die.* It occurs more than once in the Bangor Antiphonary with slight variations, but the essential point is that the opening words in all cases read:

Te patrem adoramus æternum,
te sempiternum filium inuocamus
teque spiritum sanctum in una diuinitatis
*substantia manentem confitemur.**

II

The omission of *tuum* cannot, I think, be allowed if MS. evidence is to count for anything. Out of over 100 MS. I have only found one (Paris B.N., Lat. 103, tenth century, St. Denis ?) in which it is omitted, and even then it has been interlined by (I fancy) the original scribe. Another line of argument is available—namely, the evidence of the titles, etc., in

* In B.M. Roy. MS. 2, A. xx., f. 46 , there occurs:

IN NOMINE DĪ SUMMI
PAX (pat)RIS ÆTERNI LUMINIS SALUS SEMPITERNA.

the MSS. as shewing that, at any rate, as far as we have evidence to shew how the *Te Deum* was interpreted, it all points away from the idea that, as a whole, it was addressed to Christ.

I. Irish Texts.

(*a*) London, B.M. Harl. 7653 (seventh to eighth century ?), preceded by a prayer:

> Pater in nomine dī sūmi
> pater inmense maiestatis p
> uenerandū filiū tuum uerū uni
> genitū te deprecamur ut amoris
> tui ardor aǧeatur in nobis.
> Sc̄m quoq: paracletū sp̄m ora
> mus adiuuare nos.

(*b*) Dublin, Trin. Coll. E. 4. 2 (eleventh century) has this heading:

> laus sc̄æ trinitatis q Augustin; sc̄s 7 ambros,us hęc est composuit.

(*c*) Camb. Univ. Lib. Ll. 1. 10 (818-830) the Book of Cerne has merely the title:

> Laudatio dī.

The other Irish texts have no title.

II. Milanese Texts.

(*a*) Munich, S.B. Clm. 343 (tenth century):

> Ymnus sc̄æ trinitatis.

(*b*) Rome, Vat. lat. 82 (tenth century):

> Hymnū in honore trinitatis.

(*c*) Rome, Vat. lat. 83 (*c.* 1000):

> Hymnus in honore sc̄æ trinitatis.

No manuscripts that I have consulted of Mozarabic and Received text provide evidence one way or another; but I feel the evidence of the Irish and Milanese MSS. is adequate proof that at any rate from the seventh century the usual interpretation has held the field.

III

But there still remains the theory of interpolation. Mr. Whitaker is modest in his demands: the omission of one word is all he asks. Mr. Smee (Theology, January, 1933, p. 45) proposes that verses 11, 12 and 13 be cut out.

If I am right in arguing that *æternum patrem* cannot possibly be applied to Our Lord and that *tuum* ought to be retained, then our excisions must extend much further than Mr. Whitaker's *tuum*. Verse 2, at any rate, must be sacrificed, and personally I feel that verses 3, 4, 5 and 6 must follow naturally.

But really the whole theory of interpolations is unnecessary, and would never have been started but for a preconceived idea what a hymn of this type ought to be like.

Let us see what can be said for the unity of the first part as it stands

(verses 1-13). There is the unity of rhythm (verse 7 being the only exception; see *J. Th. St.*, October, 1929, p. 50). There is the parallelism between verses 1-6 and 7-13, where we have the hosts of heaven praising God in words from Isaiah vi., followed by the distinctively Christian confession of faith of the Church on earth. But the unity of the first section is not seriously in question apart from the assumption that it is addressed to Christ. Where the modern mind feels uncomfortable is at the transition from verse 13 to verses 14-21.

Now whatever we may think of the theories of the late Dom Paul Cagin taken as a whole, one thing he has made abundantly clear—namely, that if we would appreciate the literary characteristics of the *Te Deum* it is to the ancient anaphora that we must turn, and that not merely for verbal parallels, but for general sequence of ideas as well. Dom Cagin has displayed the evidence in such abundance of detail that it is to his book that I must refer the reader. However, I can serve my purpose here by giving examples on two crucial points.

(*a*) The position of the *Sanctus* between two groups of worshippers, or choirs.

The Mozarabic *Illatio* for Easter:

Unde merito illi omnes Angeli . . .
Te celi celorum, te Potestates . . .
Tibi Cherubim ac Seraphim
incessabili uoce proclamant dicentes.
Agyos, Agyos, Agyos, Kyrie.
Otheos, Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus:
Dominus Deus Sabaoth. Pleni
sunt celi et terra gloria maiestatis
tue: osanna filio Dauid. Benedictus
qui uenit in nomine Domini: osanna
in excelsis. Agyos, Agyos, Agyos.
Te Domine laudat omnis virtus
celorum: et exercitus angelorum.
Tibi hymnum depromunt melliflua
carmina Sanctorum.
Tibi psalant choree Virginum: et cetus confessorum.
Tibi genua curvant celestia. Terrestria. Et Inferna;
Laudant te Regem omnium seculorum.
*Osanna in excelsis.**

And again, from Missale Gothicum in the Mass for Easter:

Te anim, omnipotens Deus creaturarum cœlestium multitudo, et innumerabiles Angelorum chori sine cessatione proclamant, dicentes. Sanctus.
Tuo jussu, Domine, condita sunt uniuersa in cœlo et in terra, in mari et in omnibus abyssis.
Tibi Patriarchæ, Prophetæ, Apostoli, Martyres, Confessores, atque omnes Sancti gratias agunt:†

(*b*) The christological and soteriological theme in the *Post Sanctus* (corresponding to verses 14-21 in the *Te Deum*).

It will be enough to quote the Stowe Missal and refer the reader to Dom Cagin for further details.‡

Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, dominus deus sabaoth; pleni sunt cæli et uniuersa terra gloria tua. Ossanna in excelsis, benedictus qui uenit in nomine domini. Ossanna in excelsis. Benedictus qui uenit de celis ut conuersaretur in terris, homo factus est ut dilicta carnis deleret, hostia factus est ut per passionem suam uitam æternam credentibus daret.

---

* *Te Deum on Illatio?*, pp. 9, 315.
† *Op. cit.*, p. 319.
‡ *Op. cit.*, pp. 395-406.

IV

Mr. Smee believes that the position of *prophetæ* between *apostoli* and *martyres* implies a second-century date. I feel that the well-known passage in Cyprian's *de mortalitate*, c. xxvi., is an adequate explanation, and that the mere fact that Cyprian's prose is metrica, whereas the *Te Deum* is rhythmical, is evidence enough to put the latter very much later (fourth or fifth century).*

V

Having ventured to criticize the theories of others, it seems only fair to advance one of my own upon which they can retaliate. It can be stated in a series of propositions.

(*a*) The original *Te Deum* ended with verse 21, as in Harl. 7653.

(*b*) Verses 22, 23 were added in Spain (the Mozarabic text has preserved *Amen* at this point).

(*c*) Verses 24, 25 appear first in Bangor Antiphonary (and in Paris B.N., Lat., 9488, eleventh century, without verse 29) with *Amen*. I believe this addition, like the opening words of Psalm cxii., was of Irish origin; Psalm cxii. at the beginning and Psalm cxlv. 2 at the end make an extraordinarily appropriate frame for the hymn.

(*d*) The Milan text differs, the order of verses being 21, 24, 25, 22, 23, Dan. iii. 52, *Amen*. Now verses 24, 25 come after the *Gloria in excelsis* in Codex Alexandrinus and B.M. add. 34209. My theory is that 24, 25, Dan. iii. 52 were added at Milan before the Spanish addition of 22, 23. When these latter became known, they were inserted in their unaccustomed position so that the additional verses might begin and end with the same words as those following the *Gloria in excelsis*.

For the moment I leave my theory there. There is a good deal more that might be said, but that, I think, ought to be enough to draw criticism.

MAURICE FROST.

COMMUNISM AND THE GROUPS IN CHINA

I HAVE known Dr. Buchman and the work of the Groups for some fifteen years, ever since his visit to China in 1918, where the work of the Church in my own diocese of Hankow was greatly benefited by what he did.

During the past two years I have seen the influence of the groups extend in a remarkable way, especially in the large cities of the Yangtze valley. This summer I was particularly impressed on finding that *For Sinners Only* was being read and was very greatly influencing some of the most prominent political leaders of present-day China. For some of these the reading of this book had manifestly brought a new realization of the significance of their Christian faith. Two of them, hearing that I was going on a special mission to America at the request of

* Illic apostolorum gloriosus chorus
illic prophetarum exultantium numerus
illic martyrum innumerabilis populus
ob certaminis et passionis gloriam et
uictoriam coronatus.

See Dom G. Morin's discussion in the *Revue Bénédictine*, April, 1907, pp. 188-191, in the course of a long review of Dom P. Cagin's book.

our National Council in New York, wrote a letter which seems to me of sufficient significance to be of interest to readers of THEOLOGY. The following are its chief paragraphs:

"Communism in China today offers Christianity its supreme challenge. The two exist side by side. The people of China everywhere are weighing the programme of Christianity against that of Communism.

"Certain areas of China are definitely in Communist hands. In the provinces of Fukien and Kiangsi, for example, through the great effort of our Nationalist armies this spring, many portions have been reclaimed from Communist control. In the rehabilitation of these areas, the Christian Church must demonstrate as universal a concern for the needs of common men as Communism has professed.

"Far from the policy of retrenchment to which the Churches in the West have committed her, China needs not fewer missionaries but more. We believe that Christianity can give to China what Communism never can—a sense of the Divine Purpose of a loving Heavenly Father in our lives.

"We pray for the help of the Christians in the West, that we may not fail Him in His high purpose for China."

The Group is the livest thing I have seen in Christendom. It looks to me like a modern Franciscan adventure—full-time members of a team corresponding to the friars, and of all us summoned to participation in the Third Order, to be *joculatores Domini*, and to catch men.

On my way back to China I have been visiting Uppsala, Stockholm, Oslo, Copenhagen, Zurich and Berlin. I have found the Groups exerting an increasing influence in all these places, raising in the minds of political and ecclesiastical leaders, as they have in my own, a lively hope and often deep conviction that in the Group is to be found the answer to the deepest needs of our modern life—personal and social, in both Church and State.

LOGAN HERBERT ROOTS.

(Bishop of Hankow, former Chairman of the House of Bishops of the Chinese Church).

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

THE January issue of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* opens with a fine article on the attitude of Calvin to democracy. No doubt Father Mercier is technically correct in not regarding the Pope of Geneva as a precursor of democracy, though the curious result emerges that, wherever Calvinism appears, democracy follows in its train. Father Constant continues and concludes his survey of the religious awakening of France at the opening of the nineteenth century. Inevitably after the French Revolution there was that tendency towards authority of which we discern signs at this moment in our own generation. Father Duhr writes a short note on the "De fide" of Bachiarus. Father de Ghellinck studies the career of Peter Lombard, paying marked attention to his chronology. Father Barraclough prints a document on the attitude to obedience in 1398 in the Gallican Church.

R. H. MURRAY.

REVIEWS

THE GOSPEL OF MODERNISM. By R. D. Richardson. Skeffington. 3s. 6d.

This is an attractive book. It reveals an ardent religion, God-centred, deeply spiritual, firmly set on devotional, institutional and moral foundations. It is positive and constructive in its message, and its intellectual quality is high. If Mr. Richardson's "Modernism" is to be taken as the standard of that commodity, there will be few who will not treat it as a religion deserving sincere respect. Its philosophical basis seems to be more dubious; and this is the point of chief importance, since Modernism elaims to be an advance on other Christian philosophies in its fearless acceptance of Truth.

It is always difficult to know what is meant by "Modernism." I remember that Rashdall, with his strong rationalistic mind, did not care for the word and preferred to speak of liberalism or Broad Churchmanship. Mr. Richardson says that he means "the Modernism which has appeared in English-speaking Christianity, that which has inherited the spirit of the Reformation and, faced by a new accession of knowledge, would continue that work of reform." But those who first claimed the name were Italians and Frenchmen, and they had no faith in the Reformation. Indeed, it is hard to know what, if anything, the spirit of the Reformation can be. If Mr. Richardson had lived in Calvin's Geneva, he would have been in grave danger of being burnt at the stake. A great deal, too, of what Mr. Richardson actually writes could have been delivered with acceptance at an Anglo-Catholic Congress or at a conference of Evangelicals. On theism and on the Old Testament he has admirable passages. The differentia of the Modernist of Mr. Richardson's type is not a critical estimate of the Bible or the scientific spirit. It is, first, a definite rejection of the doctrines of the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb; secondly, a tendency to minimize, in Christological speculation, the distinction between Deity and Humanity in such remarks as "the Divine is to be seen in the human—most of all when the human reached its divinest form" —"in the human nature of Jesus we have the highest and purest unveiling of Deity known and conceivable; it was achieved through a perfect union of wills"—"in the sphere of character and personality Jesus has equality with God." There are, thirdly, a few easily detachable party slogans (*e.g.*, "sacraments cannot be reserved") of recognizable origin. Of these distinguishing marks the third seems of passing importance. The

first clearly depends on the second. It is the second which is fundamental.

Jesus is perfect man, according to Mr. Richardson. "He is different from other men—different as diamonds are from charcoal, though both be composed of the same stuff—because the divine image in which God created man is seen in Him alone in its full glory." That is as orthodox as it is true, so far as it goes. But Christianity has always said, with more or less precision from apostolic times, "My Lord and my God." It has expressed its tradition about Jesus by worshipping Him, as well as by revering Him, and by describing Him as very God of very God. And by that it did not mean that if you could find a man whose will was in perfect union with the will of God you would find, necessarily, the Eternal Word of God made man for us men and for our salvation. In fact, Christianity came to see in the Mother of Jesus one whose will was perfectly conformed to the will of God, but it never worshipped her as God incarnate. Man is made "in the image" of God, but he cannot have the quality of Deity. If, to use Aristotle's language, the potentiality of man is raised to full actuality, he does not cease to be man and not God. For the creature cannot cross the gulf which separates creature, even created Spirit, from the uncreated Spirit which alone has Deity and is to be worshipped as God. Such a man would be a glorious revelation of the creative power and goodness of God; he would not be God coming to take away the sins of the world.

It is here that the difficulty of finding the gospel of Modernism really presents itself. Mr. Richardson's Modernism claims to be a modern presentation of the Christian gospel of salvation. But there is a radical ambiguity in its doctrine of God, which leaves the inquirer unsatisfied. Either God has been made man, or a prophet who was perfect man has been created to lead God's people back to God. To say that these two propositions are identical in meaning might be possible on a purely immanentist theory of God. To make it consistent a Modernist Christology should be contrived on the basis of a metaphysic like that of Mr. Alexander. But Mr. Richardson is too good a theist for that.

We cannot have it both ways. Either historic Christianity is fundamentally right in its claim that Christ is God not simply in virtue of his human perfection, but because in Him God was made man, the Logos was made flesh and dwelt among us, in which case there is no serious objection to the miraculous birth and resurrection; or there has been no such irruption of Deity into human affairs, and Christianity has been the worship of a deified hero, and in its deepest thoughts a delusion. The *via media* of Modernist theology seems to us to fail not primarily

in its view of miracle or even in its Christology; these things are not negligible defects, but they are secondary. The failure is a failure to realize the implications of the doctrine of God which Modernists share with other Christians. It has been said that Modernists sometimes exhibit a certain satisfaction in their superior intellectual enlightenment, and contrast it with the obscurantism of "traditionalists." There may be some truth in this accusation or there may not. But our difficulty with Modernism is not in habituating ourselves to new and unconventional truth. We have been familiar with Modernist literature from boyhood, and owe very much to such men as Tyrrell. Rather we have come to believe that the hearts of Modernists are in the right place, but their philosophy of theism fails to justify any confidence in the superiority of the specifically Modernist theology.

H. BALMFORTH.

COUNTER ATTACK FROM THE EAST. By C. E. M. Joad. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 6s.

Sir S. Radhakrishnan's philosophy is here presented to the Western public by Mr. Joad as bringing to the West a new outlook which is fundamentally that of Hinduism. But, in fact, his system is not compatible with Hinduism for the following reasons: (1) he is an intuitionist; (2) he is a disbeliever in Scripture; (3) he is not a consistent thinker.

Besides all this, Radhakrishnan is sceptical of the spiritual life of the Western people (p. 163); he believes that the caste system, which was originally a wholesome institution, is "a degradation today" (p. 168), that the doctrine of rebirth is valid and that institutional religions serve no useful purpose.

Intuition has never been the groundwork of religious life in India, and Radhakrishnan's teaching in this connection makes against the spirit of Hinduism. It was a sacred duty—a duty the infringement of which entailed great punishment—of the Brahman to study the Vedas from day to day. Hence another name of the Vedas is *Swadhya* or daily reading. We learn from the Upanishads that pupils desiring Brahmajnan (knowledge of Brahma or God) were made to undergo a long preparation. Krishna also enjoins rigid spiritual discipline in Gita and insists on the need of a Guru or teacher. In fact, there is not a single accredited religious book in Hinduism but dwells eloquently on the importance of an elaborate discipleship. The religious teacher, therefore, came to be regarded and is still regarded in orthodox circles as next to God. It is also a well-known fact

that no one was considered duly qualified to receive philosophical training until he had thoroughly mastered the Vedas, which are held as Divine Revelation. The first aphorism in *Brahma Sutras* is an indisputable proof of it. Indeed, so great is the reverence of the Hindus for *Shruti* (Revelation) that the philosophical systems, however divergent, invariably pretend to conform to it. No philosophical system receives due recognition in India until it acknowledges the authority of *Shruti*. This allegiance to *Shruti* is, of course, sometimes very artificial, as the philosopher must anyhow read his own doctrines into it, but it cannot be dispensed with. I see Das Gupta (quoted by Mr. Joad on p. 169) criticizes this procedure of the Hindu philosophers. Das Gupta is a sound student of Hinduism, and I here take occasion to record my sincere regard for his attainments.

But, strangely enough, "the good Hindu" (to use Mr. Joad's own phrase about Sir S. Radhakrishnan) completely ignores *Shruti* and evermore extols intuition, on which his whole teaching is based.

Radhakrishnan is a disbeliever in Scripture. He is represented as having no faith in "rules and formulæ, prescriptions and prohibitions" (*C.A.E.*, p. 159). What I have already said sufficiently demonstrates that Radhakrishnan's position is untenable according to the orthodox traditions of Hinduism. Let me hope he would not be so unwise as to declare that Sankara took a wrong view of Scripture when he pronounced it as indispensable to the performance of good works and abandonment of evil deeds—that is to say, to the leading of a righteous life.

The Hindu apologist's defence of caste is puerile. Caste is not only "a degradation today," but has always been so. The horrible laws of Manu against the Sudras (non-Brahmans of a low type) are an indelible stain on our national life. The vast millions of "untouchables" in India are "untouchables" by inviolable *Shastric* (Scriptural) injunctions. I wonder why the learned apologist ignores it.

The doctrine of rebirth as expounded by Radhakrishnan is rather fantastic. Rebirth is only a hypothesis in Hinduism, and even Krishna, the greatest Hindu incarnation of God, does not run the risk of proving it. Hinduism most dogmatically affirms that evil-doers are born as vile brutes. Mr. Joad would, indeed, have been shocked to hear Radhakrishnan declare that a human soul—depraved, of course—could be born as *vitvaraha*—*i.e.*, a dung-eating pig. But Radhakrishnan, who addressed European audiences in England, was discreetly silent about it.

Radhakrishnan professes to be a monist and withal a believer

in what he calls social salvation. He criticizes in this connection the idea of "the perpetuation of individuality," as inculcated by Christianity, with his characteristic banter. But is his doctrine of social salvation tenable in the face of his avowed monism? "So long," he says, "as some individuals are unredeemed, the other freed souls have work to do and so retain their individuality." What a monstrous distortion of the accredited monism of India! *Moksha* or salvation, according to Vedanta, absolutely precludes the idea of separate individuality and consequently of work or action. I could cite numberless verses from Hindu scriptures and also from the great Sankara's writings to prove the absurdity of Radhakrishnan's standpoint, if space permitted. But I think one quotation at least is needed. "Release is nothing but being Brahma [God]. Therefore Release is not something to be purified (*i.e.*, by work or action). And as nobody is able to shew any other way in which Release could be connected with action [work], it is impossible that it should stand in any, even the slightest, relation to any action [work] excepting Knowledge." I have purposely given Dr. Thibaut's translation here. Then Sankara goes on to prove in a masterly way that knowledge is not work. Now arises the question. Is this beautiful doctrine un-Hindu? No, it is not. The doctrine of the so-called social salvation is found in Bhagawat Puran, which belongs to the Bhakti school, and the Bhakti school upholds dualism. It is also traceable to Buddhism, to Mahayan Buddhism, if I am not mistaken. Radhakrishnan as a monist has no right to preach and advocate it. Let me, however, add here that this really great doctrine is scarcely known to the Hindus except the very cultured few and does not at all influence their practical lives. Hinduism is notoriously individualistic. The altruistic activities that are now observable in some parts of India are mainly due to Christian influence—an instance of the emulation of Christian ministering to the sick and poor as carried on by Christian missionaries all over India.

As to the scepticism of Radhakrishnan about the spiritual attainments of European races—a scepticism fully shared by Mr. Joad—I beg to say that the immense outpouring of serious literature in Europe year after year is a phenomenon pointing to a very different conclusion. Besides, the number of men and women who go abroad every year to minister to suffering humanity in a variety of ways is an unmistakable proof of the spiritual greatness of Europe. Radhakrishnan complains of the want of "retirement" in the West and Mr. Joad also echoes his sentiments. But Radhakrishnan perhaps does not know that the religious communities in Europe observe long hours of silence every day. And if it is contended that the belligerent

spirit of the European nation is a standing disproof of their spiritual greatness in justice, let me say, then, that at no time in the past has India been free from war. India had waged most sanguinary wars before the famous Kurukhetra which finally brought about her collapse, The Indian sages also, we learn from the Mahabharat, zealously shared this passion for blood. But my words must not be construed into a vindication of war, or aught leading to war. What I mean is, that civilization has always its darker aspects.

My distinguished countryman maintains that Hinduism is a tolerant religion and, by way of contrast, casts aspersions on Christianity. I wonder if there could be a worse misreading of Indian history. Hinduism has most relentlessly persecuted all new sects—Jainism, Buddhism, Vaishnaivism, etc. Even in recent times the Brahmo Somaj people and the Indian Christian converts have not escaped persecution.

I have finished. Mr. Joad is "an avowed agnostic" and a bitter opponent of "official religions" (p. 212). He says that he has in his book, *The Present and Future of Religion*, criticized "the Christianity as practised by the Anglican Churches" (*Counter Attack*, p. 122). Radhakrishnan, catching contagion from my Bengalee fellow-countrymen, is also out with his bombs and revolvers to destroy all religions that he may have the *swaraj* of intuition. The alliance of these two brilliant rationalists is ideal, indeed.

"Grove nods to grove, each alley has its brother."

CHUNI MUKERJI.

NOTICES

THE PRESBYTERIAN TRADITION. By the Very Rev. Chas. L. Warr, D.D. Published by Alexander Maclehose and Co. 1933. 7s. 6d. net.

An exposition of the Presbyterian Tradition must be of special interest in view of the conversations proceeding between representatives of the Church of Scotland and representatives of the Anglican Communion, and when such a book comes from the pen of the Dean of the Thistle, the author's eminence and conspicuous gifts of oratory enhance one's expectation of a notable work. Dr. Warr has not had the persons engaged in these conversations in mind, in writing his book, so much as the Scottish layman, for whom he has written this "handbook," painting on a large canvas a panorama of Church History in a broad and easy style, using to considerable effect his powers of eloquent phrasing and telling narrative. His theme, eagerly undertaken and presented with conviction, is the continuity of the Church in Scotland as preserving throughout its history, albeit at one time eclipsed by Episcopal or Papal dominance, a true and

primitive Apostolic Succession in the Presbyterate. The connecting link between the earliest times and the resurgence of this primitive order at the Reformation is largely, he urges, to be traced in monasticism. The story after the Reformation is that of staunch refusal to go back on this claim to historic continuity in the Presbyterate. Thus Dr. Warr does not merely claim for Presbyterianism a return to primitive order, but the maintenance of a principle never wholly obliterated. He does not merely claim for his Church a pure and Protestant faith, but a continuous life as a true branch of the Catholic Church. In a word, Presbyterianism may claim the title Catholic and Apostolic as truly as, or even more truly than, Episcopalianism; for Episcopacy, if at times and with certain safeguards useful and dignified, is not essential to true Apostolic Order.

It is well that this point of view should be clearly set forth, and set forth in terms which the ordinary man can understand.

But Dr. Warr has succumbed to the temptation which besets the orator, and has asserted his claim in a manner that is necessarily provocative, because at the controversial points he is not at pains to present his case with careful and judicious balance. Thus in two phrases—" the vast majority of the irreconcilable Episcopalians (in 1690) were eventually deprived of their livings, and formed themselves into the Scottish Episcopal Church " (p. 329), and again " all these sects (excepting the Episcopalians) who disjoined themselves " (p. 336)—Dr. Warr permits himself to use expressions which provoke antagonism. It is not thus that a spirit of rapprochement is engendered.

It is only what we should expect when we find him making much of the fact that Episcopacy emerged gradually, and in some places sooner than in others. He accepts the theory of a first order of Apostles, Prophets and Teachers as " extraordinary " and evanescent. These gave place to Presbyter-Bishops, but he hardly shews good reason for stopping the process of the evolution there. If there was no Bishop at Corinth when the unruly presbyters' action evoked the letter of Clement, there was a Bishop very shortly after that.

It is in the later periods that Dr. Warr's method shews least favourably. Probably he escaped his own notice always throwing on Bishops or the Church of Rome, by means of an adjective or a subtle turn of phrase, a rather unfavourable light. When he deals with monasticism he speaks of the movement as largely " outwith the Church," he urges that the " individualism " of the monks preserved a Presbyterian tradition (pp. 131, 133), and seems to forget that monasticism was largely a lay movement and not one of priests, that Bishops were among its most eager upholders and reformers, and that personal jealousies are by no means the equivalent of principles of Church Order. He supports this view with no detailed evidence and gives no references to authorities.

Dealing with the Celtic Church, Dr. Warr seems to us definitely disingenuous. It is hiding the facts to say, " It was the Bishop's duty from time to time to perform certain functions when instructed by the Abbot to do so " (p. 168). It misstates the issue at Whitby in 664 to say, " The real factors operating in the struggle were . . . those fundamental differences of atmosphere, character, *order* (italics ours), and ideals which effected a cleavage " (p. 183). The insertion of the word " order " just imports into the sentence a factor which was not at issue at that time, but is the issue now. It is not fair to the party which Wilfred championed to call them " the definite Roman proselytizers and apologists."

It is clear that Dr. Warr has not meant to be unfair. He gives a frank picture of many of the less creditable elements in the history of the Reformation and later times, but he has not been at real pains to understand the position of those from whom he differs, and so falls into giving judgments which are not those of the careful historian, *e.g.* on Anglo-Catholicism (p. 359). These lapses spoil a book which otherwise should be really useful, written, as it is, with so much verve, and informed with so lofty a view of the Church's divine mission. J. R. DARBYSHIRE.

THE END OF OUR TIME. By Nicolas Berdyaev. Sheed and Ward. 6s.
GOD, MAN AND SOCIETY. By V. G. Demant. S.C.M. 6s.

Berdyaev is the seer of the moment. "I look to the thought of a new world which is to begin, the world of the new middle ages," he declares. His writings are vivid and powerful, and likely to have much influence; but it is difficult to resist the impression that he is dangerously wrong-headed and inclined to adopt the principle of Marx, whose theories he so vigorously combats, in hoping for catastrophe in the belief that only by its means is a better world order attainable. In his essay on "The Russian Revolution" Berdyaev was analyzing something of which he had profound and bitter experience. In the book before us he is less convincing as he sets out to forecast the future. "The rhythm of history is changing, it is becoming catastrophic." The end of the age is upon us, and the ascendancy of "Humanism" is doomed. It seems to us that the view taken of "Humanism" is too dark: Berdyaev has no good word to say of it as he traces it from the Renaissance to the "Enlightenment" and thence to Socialism. All that was good in the Renaissance is attributed to the element of Catholicism within it; the preceding ages had stored up beauty, the Renaissance recklessly spent it. The march of events is seen to lead to precisely the opposite goal to that which the men of the Renaissance set before themselves. They exalted the individual: the Industrial Revolution reduced him to a cog in the machine. Much of this is true, and Christians will feel much sympathy with the author's conviction that only faith in the supernatural can save society. But the case is spoilt by exaggeration. It is simply not true to say that politics are no better than "a strangling parasite and the greater part of political and social life is just bogus." Sweeping condemnation of conferences propaganda, programmes, etc., avails nothing; it is true that the world needs "a strong reaction . . . a change back in favour of interior spiritual life," but the "strong reaction" may well take the form of a despairing surrender to dictatorship.

Mr. Demant's outlook on "this ominous world" is more balanced and consequently more hopeful. Two small criticisms may be made. It is a little irritating to be always referred to one or another of the same little circle of thinkers and writers; Mr. Demant quotes Mr. Reckitt (and not infrequently Mr. Demant!), so that one is reminded of that literary mutual admiration society known as the "Hallelujah Chorus"! Another small criticism is that the title "God, Man and Society" is too vague and abstract to convey much idea of the nature and scope of the work.

The lucidity which characterizes all Mr. Demant's work makes his argument easy to follow. It intersects that of Berdyaev's essay in its

insistence upon "the primacy of the spiritual over the secular," and proceeds to discuss the challenge to the spiritual which is offered, though not always understood, by the modern configuration of the social problem. The challenge is not the active challenge of a rival philosophy so much as the dissemination of discouragement and despair, "a creeping inability to understand, control, or redirect the march of social events." Mr. Demant acutely leads readers to the economic aspect of the present chaos, which, he maintains, cannot escape the condemnation of Christian ethics.

The findings of C.O.P.E.C. are rightly disinterred and their main contentions endorsed, but Mr. Demant will not allow the C.O.P.E.C. theory of the State to pass unchallenged, nor does he ignore the possibility that Church and State may find themselves in conflict. The Church's idea of liberty is always "for something," that of the State is rather "from something." The chapter on political relationships in which this problem comes under consideration is among the best in the book, and the writer evidently shares Dr. Figgis' opinion that "it is time the Church of England gave up playing at being a majority." State absolutism tends to produce a want of seriousness in the public mind. The epigrammatic summary of conditions in Germany and Austria comes to mind. In the former things are "serious but not hopeless." In the latter they are "hopeless but not serious." In England and U.S.A. we are drifting towards the latter attitude, and if Mr. Demant's thought-provoking essay will lead churchmen to address themselves to the economic and industrial situation with understanding and application, it will not have been written in vain.

M. DONAVAN.

THE CHILDREN'S CORNER IN THE PARISH CHURCH. By Frances Lillie. S.P.C.K. 2s.

Imagine a child who feels himself too shabby or too stupid or too awkward to go to Sunday School, and who nevertheless has heard of Jesus, and who wants to know Him better. Or a child of rich and godless parents, to whom has somehow come the news that Christ calls the children to Him. Suppose one of these pushed open the door of your parish church and found everything prepared for grown-ups—large sombre pews, vast soaring roof, distant altar, great eagle lectern—why, even grown-ups might well turn away overawed and abashed; and how much more the shy and inexperienced child!

But suppose the small pilgrim found a tiny chapel all ready for him; a nearby familiar altar; a small vase filled with flowers, and another empty, waiting for his offering; a row of little blue hassocks where other children had knelt; a low table surrounded by little chairs; books about Jesus; pictures of holy things; and at Christmas a crib and the Christ Child? Then, surely, he would come forward, look at a picture of the Good Shepherd, turn over the pages of the books, stand wondering in front of the manger, and then kneel before the altar and the cross. . . .

Why not have a Children's Corner in your parish church? This admirable book will tell you exactly how to set about it.

ÆLFREDA TILLYARD.

DAS MYSTERIUM DER HEILIGEN KIRCHE. By Car Feckes. F. Schoningh. 7s.

Dr. Feckes furnishes us with a straightforward survey of the ground of the authority of the Church in the first part of his able book, while the last part proceeds to apply his views to detailed problems. As this book is dedicated to Cardinal Schulte, Archbishop of Cologne, we might expect much more on the question of authority than we actually find. As a matter of fact, the first part is almost entirely concerned with the problems that inevitably attach to the work of Jesus Christ. There is a particularly clear account of His High-priesthood. In the second part there are all too brief references to such points as the Church as the mystical body and to the sociological structure of the Church. At this moment we are all concerned for the German Churches and the fight they are making for their independence, and this naturally bestows a peculiar value on this thoughtful study of Dr. Feckes.

R. H. MURRAY.

THE UNITARIAN MOVEMENT IN THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF ENGLAND. By H. McLachan. Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

It is but natural that the Principal of the Unitarian College, Manchester, should endeavour to impress us by the weighty contributions that his small body have made to thought and learning from 1700 to 1900. The field he covers is certainly wide enough. Biblical scholarship, education, journals and periodical literature, doctrine, philosophy, history, biography and belles-lettres, all are scrutinized. The names most prominent in this painstaking book are John Aitkin, Robert Aspland, Charles Beard, J. R. Beard, Thomas Belsham, J. E. Carpenter, W. E. Channing, P. Doddridge, J. Drummond, Alexander Bordon, J. Martineau, J. Priestley, J. J. Tayler, J. Taylor, J. Toulmin, and C. Wellbeloved. Few of these, we are afraid, stand in the front rank with the exceptions of Carpenter and Channing, Doddridge and Drummond, Martineau and Priestley. Nevertheless, this is a useful book, for it gathers together many out-of-the-way facts, and for the discharge of this duty we feel grateful.

R. H. MURRAY.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF CAMBRIDGE TO THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

This is a reasonably accurate guide-book to the prominent personalities in the theological and religious life of Cambridge who contributed directly or indirectly to the progress of Catholicism. Notable omissions are Stewart Headlam and C. G. Griffinhoofe, the historian of the Confraternity of the Holy Trinity. He has neither noticed nor sought to explain the distinctive character of the Revival at Cambridge. For a brief period at the outset it was more ritualistic than the Oxford Movement. But later its comparative weakness compelled it to worship in College Chapels, and to learn from the faculty of Theology instead of controlling it. As a result it has always stood nearer to the main tradition of Anglican faith and practice. It has gained a larger power of permeation; it has lost in driving force and in numbers. It would be interesting to speculate which is the better method of action. The curious result is that Cambridge has affected

the whole movement less than Oxford; but within the University it has had a far greater effect on the College Chapels. Since *Lux Mundi* it has overtaken, if it has not outstripped, Oxford in the work of reconciling the Catholic faith to the development of modern thought. *Lux Mundi* was entirely the work of Oxford men; in *Essays Catholic and Critical* there were seven of each and one amphibian. We cannot help feeling that Dr. Sparrow Simpson has been content with isolated facts, and has failed to notice the underlying principles.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

YEA AND NAY. By the Ven. G. H. Clayton. Mowbrays. 2s. 6d.

This is a collection of sermons preached in Chesterfield Parish Church. It is sometimes said that Anglo-Catholics neglect preaching. If this means that they do not think it necessary to indulge in flights of emotional rhetoric, we hope and believe that the charge is true. If it means that they do not preach the Gospel with the simplicity that comes from understanding, the Archdeacon of Chesterfield's sermons shew at any rate one notable exception. We would recommend this book not merely as a straightforward proclamation of the elementary truths of the Gospel, but also as a pattern of "plain and parochial sermons" for the present day. All candidates for Holy Orders should read it as a model for their work of preaching.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

A SHORT HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. By E. E. Kellett. Victor Gollancz, Ltd. 5s.

The writer of this book sticks to his title. He has written neither a history of religion nor a comparative study of religions, but a history of religions; and he skilfully avoids the almost inevitable disjointedness of a series of sections dealing in turn with each of the world's religions by making the history of Christianity the main thread of his story, and introducing the others at suitable places as he moves along. He does not expect his readers to be greatly interested in the origin of religion or in its lowlier forms, and he therefore touches lightly on them at the beginning of the book, stating plainly his own conviction—it is a rare thing for him to do this—that religion has evolved from very humble beginnings. As to the religions which Christianity gradually displaced when it moved out from Palestine, and the religions which it encountered but did not displace, and consequently still confronts, and the newly fashioned religions or quasi-religions which compete today with Christianity and with one another, he treats them all with respect and with knowledge. As for Christianity itself, which is dealt with at length, he has in view the West rather than the East, and, after the Reformation, the non-Roman communions rather than the Church of Rome. In all this the writer's only serious failure, from the "history" point of view, is to be found in his account of Buddhism, which offers most inadequate help to the reader who seeks information about the development of the Mahayana Buddhism and about its differences from the Hinayana form. This is particularly important in view of the fact that at the close of the book we are left to choose between the Buddha and the Christ, or perhaps not to choose, but to recognize that "there is much to be said on both sides," and thus declare ourselves rid of what the author terms a "narrow parochialism."

The author is certainly not to be accused of seeking to demonstrate the superiority of a particular religion and to win us to it. Indeed, the most striking thing about the book, next to the writer's general accuracy of statement, in his disinterestedness. Very rarely does he allow himself to express an opinion or to be moved from the detachment of an independent spectator. And this will, of course, commend the book to many, as a guarantee of impartiality of treatment; while others will connect with it the fact that, in spite of the abundant information that is supplied, the real secret of religion remains undiscovered by the author, and that the things that belong to that secret are completely missed or at best receive but superficial treatment. It is not altogether the fault of the index that Prayer finds no place in it (though Prayer Book does, and even "revision of"); that Sacrifice is dismissed as "Sacrifices, human, among Hebrews"; that under Sacrament we are merely told "*See* Eucharist, Mass. A sacred drama"; and that there is but one reference for Monachism and Monasticism. Mysticism finds no mention, nor does Asceticism. The Sufis and faqirs of Islam are missing, and so are the sadhus of Hinduism. I admit that this is partly the fault of the index; but it is a not unfair indication of the writer's failure to plumb the depths of his subject and of his defective scale of values in the great theme of which he writes with such learning and skill. The book is, in fact, an almost perfect guide for those who desire to become honorary members of all religions and practising members of none.

OSCAR HARDMAN.

DIE RUSSISCHE GOTTLOSENBEWEGUNG. By Adolf Ziegler. Verlag Kösel and Pustet, München.

So fully documented an account of the Atheist Movement in Russia as is given in this Roman Catholic but completely objective book is to be warmly welcomed. It is sufficient to say that almost every conceivable method is being used to stamp out religion, both corporate and individual. The persecution is in some respects far worse than in the Roman Empire, because it is unremitting and has at its disposal the technique of the modern Sovereign State. Rather than summarize a painful record it will be better to suggest one or two things for admonition.

The Russian Church was a part of the "Cæsaro-papal" State system which the Revolution overthrew. Some punishment was inevitable, but the magnitude of it far exceeded the crime. The Church had not been allowed to function independently, and so was not really responsible. The hate of the revolutionaries for religion was based largely on their conviction that it was untrue, science having proved this. The weapons they used were forged in England, France and Germany, from which they took nineteenth-century materialism. The New Russia must be based on science, with which religion was incompatible. The priests shared the life of the people; peasants by origin, they were poor with the poor. *This did not save them in the proletarian revolution.*

While the leaders are trying to extirpate all religion, the masses are forming a new religion of their own, a sort of naive Russian version of Herbert Spencer, a Humanism which Ziegler calls "Man-ism." Thus "Lenin is ever with us, Lenin lives evermore" is written up in schools.

Of the resistance of the people we hear little. In the popular phrase, Christianity has "gone into the Catacombs." Dr. Ziegler tells us that we

must not expect much news. But what he does give us leads us to hope that the worst—an æonian disappearance of Christianity such as came to pass in North Africa—will not happen. W. K. Lowther Clarke.

The Achievement of Nazareth. By the Rev. C. G. Hoste. Longmans. 6s.

Mr. Hoste bases his whole narrative upon our Lord's life at Nazareth, but, saving one incident, we know nothing of this life. We might, of course, approach the background of His life through the Apocryphal books with which He must have been familiar, or we might approach it in the light of what the papyri and other sources reveal of the education for the son of the leisured or the working class of His generation. Mr. Hoste insists that the first thirty years were the formative ones, and naturally we all agree, because we must agree. Always excepting the incident of the visit to Jerusalem, what do we know of these years? We fear we know nothing, and we are amazed to find that the author has written a book of 251 pages. They are full of matter, but we are forced to ask the question, Upon what foundation does this matter rest? To that question we see no answer. R. H. Murray.

A Golden Bowl. A practical treatise on Meditation by H. L. Hubbard. Philip Allan. 3s. 6d.

This is a valuable book. Its shortness enhances its value. It can be read at one sitting and then pondered over many times before goodness is exhausted. The need of meditation is always being pressed; the question "How?", so often raised by the busy people in the world, is here answered. The author is a well-known parish priest and preacher. He is acquainted with the lives of those "encumbered with much serving." He meets their difficulties with sympathy and practical suggestions as to how, when and where. In one chapter he gives his own experiences in meditation. It is a generous thing to do, and must have cost much to do it. He writes of those inward emotions which sometimes are his. He also mentions the long periods of corresponding dryness. Readers of this book should not take it that such movements within of warmth, radiance, glowing love, or even of a sharp pain, are the experience of the majority of those who have meditated for many years. They are not, and should not be sought. If they come they can be accepted with gratitude, but their absence must never be taken as a proof of unfruitfulness in meditation. Those who meditate faithfully will find joy, peace and a deepening of purpose in their souls as they toil in the midst of the world. These are the proofs of a good meditation which all may know. Having said this much, we would persuade all who are anxious to learn how to meditate to buy this book and ponder over it. It is written for those who have but little time to spare. W. E. Lutyens.

The Christian and the Next War. By E. N. Porter Goff. Philip Allan. 2s. 6d.

Mr. Porter Goff is secretary of the Christian Organizations Committee of the League of Nations Union, and though his book was written before

Germany's withdrawal, it still remains a useful guide to the work of the League, and a thought-provoking constructive study of the present international situation from the Christian standpoint. The horrors of modern warfare are given sufficient prophylactic prominence without being overdrawn, and Mr. Goff breaks down one by one the "high and fenced walls wherein we trusted." He discusses the inadequacy of pacifism, and considers that, while the "Peace Army" proposals do great credit to the originators, they seem to be hopelessly impracticable. Under "economic warfare" Mr. Goff utters a powerful indictment of blockades. "The method of a blockade or embargo," he says, "is indefensible from the Christian point of view, for it is nothing less than . . . the attempting to get one's own way . . . through (withholding) material things which are designed by God to be the sacrament of His goodness and love." An interesting chapter deals with the humanitarian activities of the League in relation to combating such evils as epidemic diseases, traffic in women and children, and traffic in drugs. The book concludes with a plea for universal and "intelligent" prayer for peace, and an appendix contains suggestions for its use as a handbook for study groups.

MARGUERITE HOWSE.

THE CURÉ OF THILDONCK, 1785-1865. From the French of Fr. Holemans. English version by Mother Mary Clare. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

Fr. Holeman's enthusiastic little book on the life of Père Lambertz, Curé of Thildonck and "restorer" of the Belgian Ursulines, is written in the cause of his sanctification at Rome. His sanctity is typically Roman, and certain phrases call to mind Dunois' criticism of St. Joan—"she thinks she has God in her pocket." In spite, however, of passages which they may find repellent, it is impossible for Anglicans to read the excellent English version by Mother Mary Clare without feeling that they are in the presence of one whose life was truly hid with Christ in God. It was a life crowned with rare achievement, both in his parish and in his work as Superior-General of the Ursuline Community, but he remained throughout humble and interiorly mortified. In success and failure alike the Curé of Thildonck saw the working out of a loving Providence, and his biographer well says of him, "anchored as it was in God, and the Will of God, a soul such as his was not easily dismayed."

There are certain similarities between the life of Père Lambertz and that of the Curé d'Ars. The ideal of priesthood which possessed both these holy men of God must be a cause of thanksgiving, and an abiding source of inspiration for the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

MARGUERITE HOWSE.

IN CHRIST: A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 5s.

A preparatory note states that "this little treatise was planned . . . not for publication, but to serve as a groundwork for private instruction. . . . An outline of the doctrine of the Person of our Lord, of His Incarnation and His union with us, as this doctrine is set forth in the New Testa-

ment. . . . It may serve as a basis (as it is in fact designed to be) for meditation and for further study of the life-giving mystery of our Lord's indwelling in the Church and in the individual members of His Church, whereby our human nature is reconciled to God in its union with Christ our Lord." This purpose is fulfilled admirably in a style of speech that is neither too exuberant nor too restrained. Of the five parts, the first two ("Who and what our Lord is" and "Our Life in Christ") are mines of spiritual treasure. The last three ("Christ our Way," "The Sacramental Life," and "The Borderland") seem at a less inspired level; they are more instructional than revealing (as are the first two), but the instruction is sound and readable. There are not more than half-a-dozen passages where one is forcibly reminded that the author is of the Roman obedience.

The treatise could be read with especial profit by adherents of the Group Movement.

V. I. RUFFER.

PREACHING IN THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC REVIVAL. By F. L. Cross, D.Phil. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

OUTLINE SERMONS FOR THE CHURCH'S YEAR. By Marcus Donovan and C. T. Kirtland. Mowbray. 4s.

Among the many books that have been published about the Catholic Revival, Dr. Cross's appears to be the first and only study of its preaching. His study lays no claim to completeness; the subject and his treatment of it deserve larger scope than the limits of so small a book allow. We agree with the author that "the taste for reading sermons is distinctly 'an acquired taste'; but it is a taste which, once acquired, is a source of great delight." However, even for those who have in some measure acquired the taste, all sermons are not equally readable. Information is needed as to where, among the innumerable volumes of published sermons that exist, there are to be found creations of original value and of permanent interest. By summarizing the general characteristics of Tractarian and post-Tractarian preaching and the special characteristics of these particular preachers—Keble, Newman, Pusey, Froude, Manning, I. Williams, Neale, Church, Liddon and Scott Holland—Dr. Cross has provided a serviceable guide, which will be of use both to the sermon reader as such and to those who want to know how the preaching of the Revival illustrates the various aspects of its history.

Since it is unreasonable to expect the ordinary preacher to produce the requisite number of original compositions, there is great need of such books of sermon outlines as that which Mr. Donovan and Mr. Kirtland have compiled. These outlines contain a wealth of valuable material, definite teaching and useful illustrations. The book is arranged on the basis of the Church's year, but its practical utility is increased by the indexes which make it easy to find an outline sermon on almost any subject. We think it would have been an improvement if, in addition to giving each sermon a title and a text, the authors had also defined the aim of each—*i.e.*, if they had stated in a concise phrase or sentence its chief point. Unless this is perfectly clear to the preacher, it is unlikely that he will succeed in conveying it to his hearers, and some of these outlines offer such a variety of suggestions that they will be liable to encourage that diffuseness in the pulpit for which some, perhaps most, clergymen have a natural aptitude.

A. R. VIDLER, O.G.S.

THE CHRISTIAN RENAISSANCE. By G. Wilson Knight. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada. 1933. 12s. 6d.

Frankly, we are not enamoured of this somewhat pretentious book. For one thing, it is undeniably verbose and far too exuberant; for another, it is tantalizingly hard to find out exactly the significance of its "criticisms." The author, *inter alia*, presents us with "interpretations" of Dante, Shakespeare, and Goethe, though he confesses to having "small Greek, less Italian, and no German or Hebrew." We do not think it particularly helpful to say of the parables of our Lord that they were seen as "patterns in a space-time continuum." Nor will the reader be enlightened to find a parallel drawn between Jesus and D. H. Lawrence. The book concludes with a note on the poetry of T. S. Eliot, which he assures us has all the characteristics of enduring literature. "All poetry," the Professor assures us, "is Christian." Sappho, for example? or Ovid? We do not wish to imply that a careful reader will find nothing in this book to reward his search; probably he will; but the proportion of gold to quartz is not remarkable for bulk.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

THE TEACHING PARSON AND HIS PEOPLE. By J. R. Lumb. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Canon Lumb has filled his little book with the wide experience he has gleaned in the course of his ministry. There are two preliminary chapters on the teaching parson and on teaching by visiting. The rest of the book is filled with fruitful hints on how to increase the efficiency of one's labours as a teacher, and some of these hints we think invaluable. The zest of the writer sweeps us along, and as he sweeps us along we come to the last chapter on the learning parson. It is an inevitable chapter, for if the parson has been teaching on the lines Canon Lumb suggests he must have been learning, and learning with marked profit to himself as well as to his parishioners.

R. H. MURRAY.

PALESTINE, ITS HISTORY, PEOPLES AND SCENERY. By F. D. Leete. Skeffington. 15s.

The intelligent traveller will find this book of Bishop Leete an attractive account of the Holy Land, and this account is enhanced by the admirable illustrations, which have been very well reproduced. In this patient survey of the land the past and the present have been blended, and blended in happy fashion. The author is aware of the archæological treasures of the past, and he is no less aware of the political movements of the present. This means that in his book there is a sense of actuality, assuring the reader that the continuity of history is a very real matter indeed. Dr. Leete is distinctly stronger on present history than on past, and his book will in no wise supersede the labours of Sir George Adam Smith. On the other hand, the reader who wishes to understand the prospects of Zionism will learn not a little, and the persecution of the Jews in modern Germany renders Zionism one of the burning questions of the movement. There is a good index, but no map.

R. H. MURRAY.

THE TWO TREATISES OF SERVETUS ON THE TRINITY. By Earl Morse Wilbur. (Harvard Theological Studies, XVI.) Harvard University Press. 14s.

It was not for these two treatises—*De Trinitatis erroribus libri septem* (1531) and *Dialogorum de Trinitate libri duo* (1532)—but for the later and more pantheistic *Christianismi Restitutio* (1553), that Servetus perished under Calvin's vengeance. Even in Dr. Wilbur's excellent translation they are difficult, jerky, lacking in force and eloquence, though this is less true of the essay, "On the Righteousness of Christ's Kingdom," appended to the *Errors*. But they are of considerable value as a significant document of their time, and primarily in this: that in Servetus we find the Biblical scholar protesting against the language and the tendencies of philosophic speculation. "This plague of philosophy was brought upon us by the Greeks, for they, above all other men, are most given to philosophy; and we, hanging upon their lips, have also become philosophers. Perhaps some will deem it a slight fault if I admit that they have erred. But I prove this in no other way than by shewing that they never understood the passages of the Scriptures which they adduce with regard to this matter" (p. 67). And again: "We would follow the usage of Scripture, especially the teaching of the words of Christ . . ." (p. 257). He protests also, as against Luther, that men are not saved by a personal faith in Christ, but by an intellectual belief that He was the Son of God. His specific teaching on the Trinity consists chiefly in a repudiation of the concepts of *hypostasis* and *communicatio idiomatum*, and in a conception of the Trinity as a series of *dispositions* of the Divine Being for different offices. In the *Diologues* he recants his previous theory (in the *Errors*) that the Holy Spirit is an angel, and seems rather, in an interesting passage (II. 13), to represent the Spirit as "the mind of Christ, through which we so keep the very mind of Christ that we live with Christ's very life; nay, that it is no longer we that live, but Christ liveth in us. . . . Moreover, it is the Spirit of Christ, as it were His servant, that always stirs us up to knowledge of Christ, and always renews us after His image; and it is through Him that Christ is formed in us, and by Him that we are transformed into the image of Christ, and through Him that we are made to eat and drink Christ's flesh and His blood." For Servetus the centre of the Christian faith is the concrete reality of Jesus Christ, the Son of God: "I simply and candidly believe that this JESUS is the CHRIST, and is the Son of God. . . . Ponder the four Gospels, because you will not find one letter which does not speak of this faith": and all that he writes is quivering with a passionate devotion to Him. These treatises produced two conspicuous results: they rallied official Protestantism to the Athanasian Creed, and they gave the initial impulse to the Anti-trinitarian revolt. But, as Dr. Wilbur says, it is impossible to describe Servetus as a Unitarian, "for he held devoutly to belief in the Trinity, such as he defined it to be in accordance with Scripture."

C. H. SMYTH.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER